STRUCTURED VERSUS UNSTRUCTURED PROCEDURES

FOR TRAINING GROUPS IN THE EXPRESSION

OF FEELING-CAUSE RELATIONS

by

Jacqueline Ann Damgaard

Department of Psychology
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

_____
Robert C. Carson, Supervisor

_____

_____

_____

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy in the Department of
Psychology in the Graduate School
of Duke University

1973

STRUCTURED VERSUS UNSTRUCTURED PROCEDURES

FOR TRAINING GROUPS IN THE EXPRESSION

OF FEELING-CAUSE RELATIONS

by

Jacqueline Ann Damgaard

Department of Psychology
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

_____
Robert C. Carson, Supervisor

_____

_____

_____

ABSTRACT

STRUCTURED VERSUS UNSTRUCTURED PROCEDURES

FOR TRAINING GROUPS IN THE EXPRESSION

OF FEELING-CAUSE RELATIONS

by

Jacqueline Ann Damgaard

A survey of relevant literature has shown that people tend to derive a variety of benefits from training in the expression of positive and negative feeling. The present study was aimed specifically at the training of feeling-cause (F-C) relations.

In general, techniques used in structured programs have been found most effective in assertive training, especially modeling, directed roleplaying, improvised roleplaying, and performance feedback. However, no study, to the author's knowledge, has attempted to evaluate the use of combined structured and unstructured procedures.

The present study compared the relative effectiveness of four group programs: (a) 14 days of unstructured training (U/U); (b) 14 days of structured training (S/S); (c) 7 days of unstructured followed by 7 days

of structured training (U/S); and (d) 7 days of structured followed by 7 days of unstructured training (S/U). The structured program consisted of small group directed and improvised roleplaying of F-C statements with modeling and performance feedback by the therapist/coach. The unstructured program consisted of group-directed discussion of topics raised by the group members. In all four groups the treatment goals were clearly stated: (a) identification of feelings; (b) ability to use F-C statements; and (c) ability to recognize F-C relations in the speech of others.

Groups U/U and S/S (Experiment I) were conducted in September, 1973, by five psychologists at the Durham, N. C. V. A. Hospital. Groups U/S and S/U (Experiment II) were conducted in November, 1972, by four of these same therapists. Two training sessions were conducted for both structured and unstructured procedures. In order to ensure that therapists were behaving according to the project design, Bales' ratings of therapist behavior were utilized in 15 randomly selected structured and 15 randomly selected unstructured sessions.

For each experiment the groups were composed of psychiatric patients matched on a number of variables (i. e., age, estimated verbal IQ, education, diagnosis, medication, marital status, number of previous hospitalizations, and number of days of current admission) and then randomly assigned, one member from each pair, into the two groups.

Written testing sessions to measure achievement of treatment

goals and Gottschalk-Gleser type interviews to measure changes in affect and generalization of F-C expression to a new setting were conducted pre-, mid-, and post-treatment. Scoring of these instruments yielded 28 indices, which were reduced by a factor analytic model to the following five factor scores: (a) Negative Feeling Expression; (b) Positive Feeling Expression; (c) Affect; (d) Generalization of F-C Expression; and (e) Amount of Verbal Output. Changes were computed pre-mid, mid-post, and pre-post on each factor score and analyzed using a matched group analysis of variance for each experiment. Cross-experiment ANOVA comparisons were also made, with interpretative cautions noted.

Marginally significant results suggested a possible interaction effect between structure and type of feeling being learned, with unstructured procedures being more effective with positive feelings and structured procedures being more effective with negative feelings. In addition, there were trends indicating that programs ending in unstructured procedures may produce more generalization of F-C expression to the interview setting. No changes in affect or amount of verbal output were found.

The value of the present study as an example of careful methodology for behavior modification research was discussed. Suggestions were made for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

day-to-day activities;

Members of the V.A. Audio-Visual Department for many hours spent recording interviewing and group therapy sessions;

Drs. Paul Kirwin, Ceb Gaustad, Larry Dean, and Dana Sattin for serving as group therapists;

Dr. Paula Kinsbourne for conducting the assessment interviews;

Dr. Chuck Gasswint, Joyce Paul, Joe Janis, and Gail McLeod for participating as observers;

Mick Smyer, Ray Horn, Claire Hamilton, and Helen Hand for their support in the long and arduous hours of data scoring;

Carol Winget for supervising the Gottschalk-Gleser affect scoring;

Sandy Funk for executing many of the statistical analyses;

Jim Beverly for typing the rough drafts of the manuscript--

MY MANY THANKS!

Special thanks are given to the following people, whose help and friendship I have valued and will continue to value for many years. To:

Dr. Robert Carson, for his many hours of support as adviser, superviser, teacher, counselor, and friend throughout my graduate training;

Karlana Carpen, who served as "right-hand woman" throughout the project with data coding and other administrative tasks, and who has become a valued friend;

Edna Bissette, who has spent countless hours typing letters,

papers, and now, finally, this dissertation with unbelievable patience and skill;

and, finally, to my friends Drs. Susan DeVoge, Dianne Alstad, and Paul Kirwin, without whose help and love I would have collapsed on countless occasions--

MY LOVE AND APPRECIATION.

J. A. D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIXES

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One concept which appears quite consistently throughout the varied theories of psychotherapy is the importance of the identification and appropriate expression of feeling. Rogers' non-directive counseling (1965), Gendlin's experiential focusing (1962), Freud's ideas of catharsis (1920), Perls' dialoguing (1973), Lowen's bioenergetics (1958), Bach and Wyden's fair fight (1968), Janov's primal scream (1970), in addition to techniques used in the encounter group movement (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1969, 1970, 1971; Schutz, 1967, 1971), all involve the development of feeling identification and expression.

Behavior therapists have also emphasized the expression of feeling as a major goal of assertive training (Alberti & Emmons, 1970; Bumpus, 1972; Krumboltz & Thoresen, 1969; Lazarus, 1971; Liberman, 1972; Neuman, 1969; Salter, 1961; Wolpe, 1958, 1969, 1970; Wolpe & Lazarus, 1967). For example, the expression of anger is regarded as a primary inhibitor of anxiety in the reciprocal inhibition model and is frequently used as a counterconditioning behavior for anxiety experienced in interpersonal situations.

Anger has received further attention in theories of aggression, where the search is for appropriate expression (Bach & Wyden, 1968; Feshbach, 1971; Holt, 1970; Kirwin, 1970; Rothenburg, 1971; Rubin, 1969) that will not elicit further aggression on the part of the aggressor (Berkowitz, 1970) or counteraggression from the recipient (Buss, 1961).

Failure to express anger has been associated in psychosomatic medicine with various hysterical and psychosomatic symptoms, the most notable of which is hypertension (Matarazzo, 1954; Schachter, 1957).

Review of Pertinent Literature

Assertive training

The expression of feeling is one of several skills taught as a part of assertive training. There have been a number of studies emphasizing the benefits of assertive training for the individuals being trained. These studies usually involve a comparison of a structured procedure, such as roleplaying (behavior rehearsal), with other less structured procedures. In the studies which follow, the structured procedures are found to be consistently more effective in producing a wide variety of beneficial changes.

In 1966 Lazarus reported the results of a total of 75 patients treated individually by him using behavior rehearsal, direct advice,

and nondirective reflection-interpretation. He reported 86% success with behavior rehearsal, 44% with advice, and 32% with reflection interpretation. Of course, the possibility of experimenter bias must be noted in this study, since Lazarus provided both the therapy and the outcome assessment for each of the cases.

Lomont, Gilner, Spector, and Skinner (1969) did the first study to attempt to compare the efficacy of group assertion therapy and group insight therapy under controlled conditions. Using nonpsychotic psychiatric patients treated for six weeks by two experienced therapists, he compared relative changes occurring on the MMPI (Dahlstrom, Welsh, & Dahlstrom, 1972) and Leary Interpersonal Check List (Leary, 1957). The assertion group showed a significantly greater total decrease on the clinical scales of the MMPI, as well as on the D and Pt scales individually. The effects of possible differences in therapist personality characteristics cannot be ruled out in this study. Caution is also required in interpreting the data, since many statistical tests were made on groups with N's of only 5 and 7.

Hedquist and Weinhold (1970) compared the effectiveness of social learning, behavior rehearsal, and a teacher-led group discussion control in increasing the frequency of verbal assertive responses of highly anxious and socially unassertive college students. Results indicated that the two treatment groups, though not differing from one another, produced significantly more verbal assertive responses in situations external to the treatment setting than did the control group. During a

six-week follow-up, results were found to still be in the predicted

direction but no longer significant. This study represents a consider-

able methodological improvement over the two previous studies in

several important ways: (a) matched groups to control for sex, total

score on the S-R Inventory of Anxiousness, total score on the A-B

scale of the Guilford Zimmerman Temperament Survey, and two out

of three situations rated by the subjects as most distressing; (b) use

of the same counselors in both treatment groups with special training

for each procedure; (c) careful description of treatment procedures;

(d) the use of behavioral measurement external to the treatment setting

in the form of diary reporting; and (e) the collection of follow-up data

to determine the persistence of behavior change. Unfortunately, the

diary method of data collection leaves the question of reliability and

validity of the measures totally undetermined. There is also no

empirical way to determine the extent to which the counselors actually

produced significantly different behavior in the two treatment condi-

tions. Nevertheless, this study stands as one of the few examples of

controlled research with a clinical population in the area of assertive

training.

Using college women as subjects, Rathus (1972) compared the

effect of assertive training, group discussion, and no treatment on a

self-reporting assertiveness schedule (Rathus, in press), behavior in

a brief interview situation, and responses to the Temple Fear Survey

Inventory (TFSI, Braun & Reynolds, 1969). Results indicated that assertive training subjects showed significantly greater self-reported gains in assertive behavior and greater general reductions in fear than the control group. The discussion group was not statistically different from either group. The experimental condition involved training in nine different types of assertive behavior. Both groups were led by the same experimenter without evaluation of the specific behavior exhibited by him in each group. This raises the question of experimenter bias. However, discussion topics in the control group did seem to represent a logically sound alternative treatment involving issues such as the nature of fear, its acquisition and elimination, and child-rearing practices that lead to dependency and feelings of guilt. It is the first study with sufficient N's to demonstrate the hypothesized relationship between assertiveness, anxiety reduction, and increased social competence (TFSI). Generalization of such findings to clinical populations, however, requires further work.

A subsequent study by Rathus (1973) involved the addition of observing videotape-mediated assertive models to the assertive training procedure outlined above. This treatment was compared with a placebo treatment condition involving the observation of videotaped models discussing and becoming desensitized to fears, and a no-treatment control group. Again the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule, the behavior assessment interview, and the TFSI total score, plus two

factor scores (fear of social criticism and fear of social incompe-
tence), were used as dependent measures. Results indicate that sub-
jects receiving assertive training reported significantly more assertive
behavior, were rated significantly more assertive in the interview sit-
uation, and evidenced trends in the direction of lower TFSI scores than
either control group. Replication of the earlier findings lends support
to the proposed value of assertive training in increasing assertive
behavior and reducing anxiety.

Process variables in assertive training

On the basis of these studies emphasizing the importance of
assertive training as a clinical procedure, other investigators have
attempted to identify the necessary and sufficient components of the
assertive training process.

Friedman (1971) compared six different treatment conditions on
a behavioral measure of assertiveness: (a) modeling plus directed role-
playing; (b) directed roleplaying; (c) improvised roleplaying; (d) model-
ing; (e) assertive script reading; and (f) nonassertive script reading.
A two-week follow-up measure was obtained. All subjects also filled
out a self-report measure of assertiveness devised by Friedman (the
Action Situation Inventory) before and after the experiment. The
modeling plus directed roleplaying subjects showed a greater absolute
increase in Sum Assertion and a greater percentage of subjects

achieving the criterion behaviors than all other groups. Modeling,
directed roleplaying, and improvised roleplaying conditions changed
significantly more on the Sum Assertion measure and criterion behav-
iors than the nonassertive script condition but not the assertive script
condition. The assertive script subjects changed significantly more
on the Sum Assertion measure and criterion behaviors than non-
assertive script subjects. There were no significant changes in six
of seven self-report measures of anxiety, and the one measure that
showed a change indicated a slight increase in anxiety. The results
thus fail to support the reduction of arousal or anxiety hypothesis when
applied to changes in verbal assertiveness. Overall, the most promis-
ing procedures would appear to be the modeling plus directed role-
playing and the improvised roleplaying procedures.

McFall and Marston (1970) have utilized a standardized semi-
automated behavior rehearsal treatment and two variations of this
procedure (one with performance feedback and one without) compared
with two control procedures (a placebo and no-treatment condition) in
a laboratory analogue paradigm to train college students to be more
assertive. Change was assessed using behavioral, self-report, and
psychophysiological laboratory measurements, as well as an unobtru-
sive in-vivo assertive test. Results indicated that the two behavior
rehearsal procedures produced significantly greater improvements in
assertive performance than did the control conditions. There was also

evidence of a positive transfer of training to new stimulus situations. Placebo subjects responded more like the behavior rehearsal subjects on self-report measures of satisfaction and anxiety, despite their failure to show behavioral change. This points up the possible distortion of self-report and the need for behavioral measurement. The more global self-report measures--the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (Taylor, 1953) and the Wolpe-Lang Fear Survey Schedule (Wolpe & Lang, 1964)--showed no significant effects due to treatments. The Wolpe-Lazarus Assertiveness Scale (Wolpe & Lazarus, 1966), a measure more specific to the training, did reveal significant treatment effects.

As McFall and Marston point out, two alternative research strategies can be taken in investigating psychotherapy techniques. On the one hand, a fully developed treatment procedure can be dismantled systematically to determine the effects on treatment of reduced component combinations. On the other hand, one can isolate the most fundamental or theoretically important element and systematically add elements to it as the treatment effects are measured. It is this constructive strategy that they have exemplified so well.

In a subsequent study, McFall and Lillesand (1971) compared a behavior rehearsal therapy consisting of overt or covert response practice, symbolic verbal modeling, and therapist coaching with a control group. The behavior rehearsal subjects showed statistically

significant improvement in their assertive-refusal behavior on self-report and behavioral laboratory measures. Although unexpected, covert rehearsal tended to produce the greatest change.

Training in the expression of feeling

Some studies have focused specifically on the training of affect expression. Kirwin (1970) surveyed a number of studies supporting the premise that "individuals exhibiting various maladaptive behaviors may benefit from training in the verbal expression of negative and positive feelings."

In 1953 Philip Seitz reported the outcome of his dynamically oriented brief psychotherapy with 25 patients suffering from psycho-cutaneous excoriation syndromes (itching and self-inflicted lesions on the skin of presumed psychological origin). His theory led him to specify the verbal expression of rage, guilt, inferiority, and shame as appropriate treatment goals. Almost half of his patients terminated therapy when encountering some important contemporary conflict which proved too difficult for them. However, of the 13 remaining patients, those 12 who succeeded in sustaining the expression of anger outside the treatment situation showed rapid resolution of their skin problems.

Fein (1963) met with student nurses for a total of six sessions to help the students "clarify for themselves their own identities and roles, face and accept many unacceptable feelings experienced and learn how

to handle these feelings constructively for their own best development and the welfare of the patients under their care." The primary group activity was sociodrama/psychodrama. The general consensus of the staff indicated rapid improvement in relationships with patients, parents of patients, and co-workers.

Liberman (1971) compared two matched long-term therapy groups over a period of nine months of treatment. The experimental therapist used techniques of social reinforcement to facilitate the expression of positive feelings between group members while the control therapist utilized a more conventional, group-centered approach. Therapists were matched on certain personality variables. Results indicate that the experimental patients showed significantly more cohesiveness, greater personality change in predicted directions, and earlier symptomatic improvement than those in the control group. In addition to the advantages mentioned above for the Hedquist and Weinhold (1970) study, Liberman also incorporated a check on therapist differences through personality matching and data on actual therapist behavior across the treatment sessions. The study supports the utility of a reinforcement or learning approach to the understanding and practice of group therapy, as well as demonstrating the benefits resulting for patients following the increase in expression of positive feelings.

Summary

There appears to be evidence, both theoretical and experimental, to suggest that a closer look at the training of feeling expression is in order. Psychotherapy theories stress its importance. Behavior therapists have documented clinical cases to support its value as a therapeutic procedure. Comparison studies have been conducted to decide what formats are used most effectively in such training.

In general, structured procedures seem to produce greater change than unstructured procedures, specifically those utilizing modeling, directed roleplaying, improvised roleplaying, and role-playing feedback.

Rationale for This Study

Treatment goals

Investigators have specified a variety of different components of expressive behavior as their particular focus for expressive train-ing. As Kirwin (1970) has indicated, successful techniques have been developed for training the expression of anger (Doering, Hamlin, Everstine, Eigenbrode, Chambers, Wolpin, & Lackner, 1962; Wagner, 1968a, 1968b), the making of appropriate demands (Friedman, 1971), the refusal of unreasonable requests (McFall & Lillesand, 1971), the expression of certain positive feelings (Liberman, 1971), and expression in embarrassing situations (Ackernecht, 1967).

The present study deals with the training of yet another component of verbal expressive behavior, the verbalized relationship between feelings and their causes (Kirwin, 1970; Kirwin, Damgaard, & Gentry, 1973). Such feeling-cause (F-C) statements involve a written or verbal expression of the relationship between particular events and subsequent feeling states. The causal part of the F-C statement has very specific characteristics. Most generally it involves an observable, recordable event. This can be something someone says or does, or the absence of such an event. Expanded definitions are given in Appendix E.

Examples of F-C statements include:

1. "When you didn't arrive on time, I became irritated."
2. "Your gift makes me very happy."
3. "I really enjoyed the movie."

The F-C form of expression is to be contrasted with many alternative forms of feeling expression, such as:

1. Criticism: "You really are an inconsiderate person to be late."

2. Demand: "Damnit! Next time be on time, will you?"

3. Threat: "If you are ever late again, you won't find me here waiting. You can count on that!"

4. Overgeneralization: "You haven't been on time once in the last ten years!"

5. Possible nonverbal expressions: menacing posture and expression, refusal to talk, avoidance by getting up and leaving, hitting.

6. <u>Other</u>: debates about whether the other's excuse is a valid one, abstract discourse on the psychology of latecomers, and so on.

All such expressions are considered <u>distracting</u> information to be eliminated in F-C training.

The final treatment goals of this study include:

1. To be able to identify feelings.

2. To be able to express oneself in F-C statements in the absence of distracting information.

3. To be able to identify F-C statements in the expressions of others.

Two major areas of benefit seem probable from the training of F-C expression. The first area involves therapy planning. Behavior therapists need to know F-C relationships precisely. Those stimuli which produce negative or unpleasurable feelings form the target for deconditioning or environmental programming, while those stimuli which produce positive or pleasurable feelings are used as reinforcers and in counterconditioning (Lazarus, 1971; Wolpe, 1958, 1959). This information has frequently been requested through questionnaires (Cautela & Kastenbaum, 1967; Wolpe & Lang, 1964), but often the client's feelings are aroused by stimulus situations not mentioned in these instruments. An alternative strategy, and the one to be used in this study, is to train the client to identify and report F-C relations directly.

The second major area of benefit that seems probable from the

training of F-C expression is increased comfort in interpersonal

relationships. This area can be divided into three aspects: (a) reduc-

tion in physiological tension; (b) reduced probability of punishment

from others in the environment; and (c) more satisfactory general

affective states.

Hokanson and his co-workers have found that various types of

behavioral expression following anger-arousal can lead to a reduction

in physiological tension in certain interpersonal situations. It appears

that the preferred response to provocation is learned (can be trained)

rather than innate and will produce the tension reduction caused by

provocation whether it is aggressive (Hokanson & Burgess, 1962a,

1962b; Hokanson, Burgess, & Cohen, 1963), friendly (Hokanson,

Willers, & Koropsak, 1968), or self-punitive (Stone & Hokanson, 1968).

F-C expression has not been tried as one of the forms of behavioral

expression in such experiments as yet. Additional research is needed

to see if it too could result in tension reduction.

A second hypothesized consequence of F-C training is the

increased communication of negative feelings in a manner which renders

counter-aggression relatively unlikely. A statement of negative feeling

such as "When you were late, I became irritated" is considered to

result in two conditions: (a) the giving of information that makes

accommodation possible, if the recipient wishes, and (b) in a form that

preserves the recipient's self-esteem as much as possible and, hence,

reduces the likelihood of punishment. This latter point was evaluated in a study by Gaines (1973) in which he investigated the effect of four types of expression (insult, information-giving, descriptive F-C expression, and no feedback) on subsequent shock settings by the recipient. He found that the descriptive feedback indeed produced the lowest "counter-attack" of all four conditions, followed by information-giving, insult, and no feedback. This is the first study to demonstrate the potential value of F-C expression in avoiding counter-aggression from the environment while still providing a form of tension-reducing self-expression.

The final hypothesized treatment effect of F-C expression, a more pleasurable general affective state, was the relationship to be evaluated in this study. Four aspects of affect will be considered: changes in feelings of (a) anxiety, (b) hostility, (c) depression, and (d) human relatedness.

Anxiety. The reciprocal inhibition model postulated by Wolpe in his early writing (1958) identified assertive behavior as one of three classes of behavior presumed to be incompatible with anxiety responses, the other two being relaxation and sexual arousal. Later investigators have added the use of toys and parental body contact with children (Bentler, 1962) and emotive imagery such as "pride, myrth, and excitement of adventure" (Lazarus & Abramovitz, 1962).

Experimental evidence has been contradictory in its examination of this hypothesized relationship. Goldstein, Serber, and Piaget (1970) utilized the training of artificially induced anger expression as the counterconditioning agent in ten clinical cases. Clinical symptoms treated successfully included severe and constant anxiety coupled with feelings of dizziness, agitated depression resulting from feelings of personal insecurity, fear of rejection and low self-esteem, and fears of riding on public conveyances, walking in certain neighborhoods, and being in the presence of seemingly aggressive people. Thus, expression of anger was effective in counterconditioning certain anxiety responses. Rathus (1972), in a study discussed earlier, found assertive training subjects reporting significantly greater general reductions in fear as measured by the Temple Fear Survey Inventory than the control group. A subsequent study (Rathus, 1973) produced trends in the direction of lower TFSI scores for the assertive condition also. On the other hand, Friedman's (1971) study found no significant changes in six of seven self-reported measures of anxiety in any of his modeling and roleplaying conditions, thus failing to support the arousal or anxiety reduction hypothesis. McFall and Marston (1970) also found no significant effects due to treatments on two global anxiety measures--the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale and the Fear Survey Schedule. As mentioned before, placebo subjects did, however, respond more like the behavior rehearsal subjects on self-report measures of satisfaction

and anxiety, despite their failure to show behavioral change, again emphasizing the importance of behavioral measurement.

Hostility. The Freudian (1920) catharsis hypothesis, later elaborated by Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, and Sears (1939), predicts two effects from the expression of aggression: (a) the lowering of physiological arousal and (b) reduction in the probability of further aggressiveness. Some theorists such as Lorenz (1966) still support the catharsis hypothesis, postulating an innate aggressive drive which "must" find expression.

The work of Hokanson and his colleagues previously discussed demonstrated physiological tension reduction following aggression, but only under conditions which do not result in guilt (Holmes, 1963) or the threat of retaliation from the victim. Secondly, once aggression was learned as an instrumental response, there was an increased likelihood that aggression would occur in subsequent threatening encounters (Hokanson, 1970). Other empirical evidence has also consistently shown a lack of support for the instigation-reduction effect predicted by the catharsis hypothesis (Dichter, 1965; Freeman, 1962; Honhart, 1970). A series of experiments by Geen and Berkowitz (1966, 1967; Geen, 1968) has led Berkowitz (1970) to comment that "aggression is all too likely to lead to still more aggression." Thus, one might expect training of F-C statements of negative feelings to generate an increase in overt aggressive behavior.

It is critical, however, to keep concepts of anger, hostility, and aggression differentiated (Buss, 1961). Rothenburg (1971) has defined anger as a state of physiological arousal and motoric readiness caused by the perception of a threat or obstruction. He further states that anger serves to motivate behavior that will remove such threats or obstructions and can be expressed in many ways, only a few of which would be called aggression. Aggression is intended to threaten the security or self-esteem of the victim. Hostility is considered an attitudinal response, anger a cognitively labeled feeling of physiological arousal, and aggression a behavioral response. Thus, aggression and hostility are two outcomes of anger, but there are other, possibly less destructive, outcomes. One primary cause of hostility and aggression is, according to Rothenburg, unexpressed anger.

Haer (1968), in a study of patients' behavior in group therapy, found that nonaggressive expressions of anger were associated with decreases in the frequency of overt aggressive behavior.[1] Similarly, it is hypothesized that the increased ability to express anger adequately in F-C statements might result in decreases of hostility. An unpublished study by Kirwin, Damgaard, and Gentry (1973) did find a

---

[1]Conflict over the expression of anger has been found to have other adverse consequences also, including: disturbances in perception (Kaufmann & Feshbach, 1963), hypertension (Matarazzo, 1954; Schachter, 1957), other behavioral and somatic symptoms (Alexander, 1950; Grace & Graham, 1952; Saul, 1956; Scott, 1958), and cognitive inefficiency (Horowitz, 1963).

significant negative correlation between F-C expression and irritability
as measured by the Buss-Durkee Hostility Scale (Buss & Durkee,
1957).

Depression. Traditional psychiatric theories of depression
specify unexpressed anger or "anger turned inward" as the underlying
cause of depression. Lomont et al. (1969) did find an assertive train-
ing group showing significantly more decreases on the D scale of the
MMPI than an insight-oriented group. Patterson, Taulbee, Folsom,
Horner, and Wright (1968) also found that a group of depressed patients
treated with a program to encourage the expression of anger were less
depressed at the end of treatment than the patients in several other
treatment groups.

Human relatedness. Several studies of assertive training have
reported an increase in feelings of human relatedness. Fein (1963)
found improved relations with patients, co-workers, peers, and super-
visors to result from anger expression training with student nurses.
Liberman (1970) found increased group cohesiveness following rein-
forcement of positive feeling expression. Geisinger (1969) utilized
expressive training with one of his clients who reported increased
relaxation in social interactions and an improved relationship with her
husband. Finally, Martinson and Zerface (1970) found a social pro-
gram involving in-vivo assertive training to be more successful than

either individual counseling or a delayed-treatment control in over-coming fear of dating in male college students.

Summary. Past research has shown the relationship between assertive training and anxiety to be contradictory. Some studies have supported the anxiety reduction hypothesis, while others have failed to find such a relationship, at least as measured by more global anxiety measures. The relationship between assertive training and hostility has likewise been unclear. Some studies would lend support to a hostility reduction hypothesis, while others might suggest an increase in hostility following assertive training. In contrast, the studies concerning depression and human relatedness would tend more consistently to support the hypothesis of decreases in depression and increases in human relatedness as a result of assertive training.

Design

A controversy has existed for some time in the fields of education and psychotherapy regarding the most effective way to teach a particular skill, such as feeling expression. One argument, which stems from Rogerian client-centered theory (1965, 1970), asserts that un-structured, nondirective but supportive activity on the part of the teacher, psychotherapist, and group leader is most effective in facilitating learning, especially in the area of feeling expression. Such a procedure is hypothesized to promote motivation and interest, since it

allows the participants to follow those issues most central to them and to "discover" their own solutions to problems and methods of expression. This "group-centered" style requires the group to decide on the topics to be discussed within the broad area of the treatment goals. It is hypothesized that the assumption of such responsibility by the group members also makes them feel ultimately more self-confident and less anxious.

On the other hand, many advocates of behavior therapy stress the need for structured procedures to facilitate efficient learning. Such a procedure involves use of the many techniques found to be effective in learning experiments--roleplaying, modeling, behavior rehearsal/ positive reinforcement/behavior rehearsal sequences done in a hierarchy from easy situations to difficult ones, utilization of small group work to maximize individual participation, and specific learning goals. Such training often includes the use of outside assignments and more individual work between trainer and client.

From the literature previously reviewed, one would expect a structured procedure to be more effective than an unstructured procedure in facilitating F-C expression. However, no one has ever systematically compared the effects of combination treatments utilizing both structured and unstructured formats. Perhaps it would be most efficient to give clients structured training in F-C expression and then allow some more unstructured time for practice in anticipation of

utilizing the skill outside of the treatment setting. Or, alternatively, perhaps it would be most effective to utilize an unstructured format for people to "discover" their communications problems in feeling expression and then provide structured training in the F-C form.

The purpose of the present study was to compare four 3-week programs for the training of F-C expression: (a) entirely unstructured (U/U); (b) entirely structured (S/S); (c) half unstructured followed by half structured (U/S); and (d) half structured followed by half unstructured (S/U).

Specific Hypotheses

Since no investigations have systematically examined the possible benefits of combinations of structured and unstructured training programs, there are no experimental data to support specific predictions regarding the relative effectiveness of S/S, U/S, and S/U groups in producing change in the dimensions of F-C expression, affect, and generalization of F-C expression. Therefore, the hypotheses to be stated predict those procedures involving any structured training to be more effective than the entirely unstructured procedure, but do not make specific predictions regarding the relative ordering of the S/S, U/S, and S/U groups. Hypotheses for the mid-testing data predict those procedures beginning with structured training to be more effective than those procedures beginning with unstructured training.

Analysis of the data (to be described in Chapter III) required a factor analytic reduction of the number of variables in order to make appropriate statistical tests. This analysis yielded five factor scores from the F-C expression, affect, and generalization of F-C expression variables. The hypotheses will be stated with reference to four of these factor scores. The final factor score was an indicator of verbal style (quantity of output) for which no hypotheses had been formulated.

Negative feeling expression

Hypothesis 1. The S/S, U/S, and S/U groups will produce greater increases in the ability to express negative feelings from pre- to post-training than the U/U group.

Hypothesis 2. The S/S and S/U groups will produce greater increases in the ability to express negative feelings from pre- to mid-training than the U/S and U/U groups.

Positive feeling expression

Hypothesis 3. The S/S, U/S, and S/U groups will produce greater increases in the ability to express positive feelings from pre- to post-training than the U/U group.

Hypothesis 4. The S/S and S/U groups will produce greater increases in the ability to express positive feelings from pre- to mid-training than the U/S and U/U groups.

Affect

Hypothesis 5. The S/S, U/S, and S/U groups will produce greater decreases in negative affect and greater increases in positive affect from pre- to post-training than the U/U group.

Hypothesis 6. The S/S and S/U groups will produce greater decreases in negative affect and greater increases in positive affect from pre- to mid-training than the U/S and U/U groups.

Generalization of F-C expression

Hypothesis 7. The S/S, U/S, and S/U groups will produce greater increases in generalization of F-C expression from pre- to post-training than the U/U group.

Hypothesis 8. The S/S and S/U groups will produce greater increases in generalization of F-C expression from pre- to mid-training than the U/S and U/U groups.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Design

Four treatment groups were compared: (a) 14 days of unstructured training (U/U); (b) 14 days of structured training (S/S); (c) 7 days of unstructured followed by 7 days of structured training (U/S); and (d) 7 days of structured followed by 7 days of unstructured training (S/U). Groups U/U and S/S were conducted in September, 1972, with Group U/U running from 10:30-12:00 a.m. and S/S from 1:00-2:30 p.m. each day. Groups U/S and S/U were conducted in November, 1972, at the same times, respectively. The test battery to be described in the measurement section was administered one day before each group began, after the seventh group session, and on the day following the last group session.

Subjects

During September all patients on the psychiatric wards of the Durham Veterans Administration Hospital were considered for possible group participation. The following characteristics eliminated

some patients: (a) too heavily sedated to attend to group activity, due to the early phases of a phenothiazine program; (b) evidence of organic problems that would interfere with memory;[1] or (c) leaving the hospital within three weeks. All remaining patients were matched on age, estimated verbal IQ (from the Information and Similarities subscales of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale), years of education, diagnostic category, medication, marital status, number of previous hospitalizations, and number of days in the hospital on current admission. One member of each pair was then randomly assigned to one of the two treatment groups, with the other member of the pair going to the second treatment group. Each of the U/U and S/S groups initially contained 12 members. The work with these two groups comprises Experiment I. A similar procedure was followed in November, with the U/S and S/U groups initially containing 14 members each. These groups make up Experiment II. Due to unexpected discharges,[2] the final groups contained the following numbers: (a) U/U = 8; (b) S/S = 11; (c) U/S = 12; and (d) S/U = 14. All of the group members were male.

Table 1 contains the means and standard deviations for each of the interval scale matching variables by experimental condition. Tables 2, 3, and 4 contain the frequency distributions by experimental

---

[1] This information was available from the standard intake battery.

[2] These discharges all occurred within three days of the group's beginning session.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Each Interval Scale
Matching Variable by Experimental Condition

Group	Age	Estimated Verbal IQ	Education	N. Hosp.[a]	D. Hosp.[b]
U/U	30.25	95.62	10.25	2.62	69.38
	(7.89)	(18.60)	(4.17)	(1.60)	(31.15)
S/S	36.09	95.45	10.64	2.91	69.27
	(11.54)	(13.35)	(1.69)	(1.81)	(51.34)
U/S	43.83	92.50	9.42	2.91	53.18
	(8.05)	(11.86)	(3.63)	(2.26)	(18.46)
S/U	43.57	94.23	9.43	3.23	62.62
	(9.27)	(14.78)	(4.57)	(2.98)	(27.18)

[a]Number of previous hospitalizations.

[b]Number of days hospitalized on current admission.

Table 2

Frequency of Marital Status Categories by
Experimental Condition

Group	Single	Married	Divorced	Separated	Widowed
U/U	3	4	1	0	0
S/S	3	6	1	1	0
U/S	1	6	3	1	1
S/U	3	8	3	0	0

Table 3

Frequency of Diagnostic Categories by
Experimental Condition

Group	Psychotic	Neurotic
U/U	5	3
S/S	6	5
U/S	4	8
S/U	7	7

Table 4

Frequency of Medication Categories by
Experimental Condition

Group	Spheno[a]	Not Spheno
U/U	3	5
S/S	5	6
U/S	7	5
S/U	9	5

[a] On a significant amount of phenothiazines.

condition of the patients' marital status, diagnostic category, and medication.

In summary, the patients in this study averaged 30-44 years in age with an estimated verbal IQ of about 95 and a ninth- to tenth-grade education. They had been hospitalized approximately three times previously and had been in the hospital on this admission about 50-70 days. About 50% of the patients were married and 50% lived alone, 50% were diagnosed psychotic and 50% neurotic, and 50% were taking a significant amount of phenothiazines, while 50% were not. Each of these matching variables was chosen because they have been found to be related to therapy outcome measures in at least some other studies (Luborsky, Chandler, Auerbach, Cohen, & Bachrach, 1971).

Results of the statistical analyses done to evaluate the effectiveness of the matching procedure in producing equal groups on these variables will be given in Chapter III.

Therapists

The September groups, U/U and S/S, were conducted by the same five therapists. Two of these therapists were staff psychologists at the V.A., the other three being psychology interns. The group of therapists were given two training sessions for each of the structured and unstructured procedures. During the training sessions, appropriate Bales' therapist behavior categories (Bales, 1950) were discussed for each particular procedure (see Observers section) and the

therapists practiced conducting a group of staff volunteers utilizing each set of these behaviors. The training sessions were observed by four volunteer observers, who used these sessions to gain experience with the Bales system and to establish inter-rater reliability. Feedback was given to the therapists regarding the distribution of therapist behavior for each training session.

The November groups, U/S and S/U, were also to use the same five therapists. Due to unanticipated scheduling difficulties, one of the staff psychologists was unable to participate in these two groups. They were conducted by the other four therapists.

Observers

One of the primary difficulties in any research comparing different treatment modalities involves the determination of behavior actually engaged in by the therapists. In order to insure that the therapists in this study were behaving according to the project design, four observers of therapist behavior were utilized. Two of the observers were psychiatric staff members. The other two were psychology graduate students.

The Bales scoring system (Bales, 1950), utilized for the observation of therapist behavior, is given in Appendix A, along with a sample rating form. Categories of behavior include:

1. Shows solidarity, raises other's status, gives help, reward
2. Shows tension release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction

3. Agrees, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies
4. Gives suggestions, direction, implying autonomy for other
5. Gives opinion, evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish
6. Gives orientation, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms
7. Asks for orientation, information, repetition, and confirmation
8. Asks for opinion, evaluation, analysis, expression of feeling
9. Asks for suggestion, direction, possible ways of action
10. Disagrees, shows passive rejection, formality, withholds resources
11. Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws out of field
12. Shows antagonism, deflates others' status, defends or asserts self

Two training sessions were conducted with the observers during which the scoring manual was discussed and sample behaviors scored. They were given additional practice by scoring the therapists' training sessions. A fifth observer was utilized to time the total percentage of therapy time occupied by therapist speech.

Working in pairs, the observers rated eight randomly selected sessions of the U/U and S/S groups, and seven randomly selected sessions of the U/S and S/U groups, giving data on a total of fifteen unstructured and fifteen structured sessions. The categories were collapsed into four scores composed of the sums of categories 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, and 10-12. Inter-rater reliabilities between the pair of scorers were computed for each score across the total thirty sessions and yielded values of .83, .80, .85, and .92, respectively. This was considered adequate to justify averaging the scores of the raters for any given session.

Although the observers used all 12 categories for scoring, this

study focused on the two sums 4-6 and 7-9.

The following hypotheses were tested as a check on the adequacy of the difference in structured and unstructured procedures:

1. During the structured procedure the therapists will talk a significantly greater amount of time than during the un- structured procedure.

2. The sum of categories 4, 5, and 6 will be significantly greater for the structured procedures (giving suggestion, evaluation, and orientation).

3. The sum of categories 7, 8, and 9 will be significantly greater for the unstructured procedures (asking for orien- tation, evaluation, and suggestion).

Results of the statistical analyses of these hypotheses will be given in Chapter III.

Experimental Procedures

Unstructured treatment

During the unstructured sessions, all five therapists sat with the patients in a circle. A brief introduction was given by one of the staff psychologists, explaining that many difficulties result from the inability to express feelings. Specific treatment goals were presented: (a) to learn to identify feelings; (b) to be able to express feelings with their associated causes; and (c) to be able to identify feelings and their asso- ciated causes in the expression of others. Beyond this introduction, the therapists took no structuring role. Individual group members decided the topics to be discussed, while the therapists supported these

discussions, occasionally reminded the group of its stated goals, and helped facilitate feeling-cause expression, but without the use of structured procedures such as modeling and roleplaying.

Structured treatment

The seven-day structured procedure is given in detail in Appendix B (Kirwin, 1971). A briefer outline is given in Appendix C (p. 135). This procedure utilized roleplay and modeling as its central features. The materials presented in Appendix C were distributed to the group members. Much of the group activity was done in small groups of three members, two patients plus one therapist/coach. The early sessions utilized the situations in the anger script, Situations, Ang-1 (SAng-1, Appendix C, p. 129). A given person would be assigned the expressor role (Appendix C, p. 138) and asked to pick out a script he wished to roleplay. Consulting the Word List for Description of Feelings (WLDF, Appendix C, p. 128), he would then pick out two feeling words which best described the feelings he might have if he were actually in such a situation. He was then asked by the coach (Appendix C, p. 137) to circle the words on the SAng-1 list that would represent the cause for each feeling. He was instructed to use F-C statements during roleplaying and to avoid making potentially distracting comments, especially comments of a threatening, demanding, or critical nature. The situation was then roleplayed with the other small group member serving as the opposing player (Appendix C, p. 139). When the expressor was

satisfied that he had communicated his feelings, he would terminate the roleplay. Feedback was then given by the opposer and coach regarding the F-C statements communicated, plus any distracting information heard. At times the coach would roleplay appropriate expressor behavior. Several practice roleplays were conducted, until the expressor and coach were satisfied with the expression. Then the expressor passed to a second small group for a test roleplay with a new opposer and coach.

This general format was utilized to practice anger situations, situations designed to elicit other feelings (Situations, Varied-1, Appendix C, p. 132), and situations composed by the group participants to represent problem situations in their lives. These scripts were practiced in increasing order of difficulty, with feedback given in as positive a manner as possible, emphasizing the appropriate character- istics of the roleplay and making suggestions for changes that could improve the F-C communication. Outside assignments were given to practice on the ward before the next day's session. Large group dis- cussions were utilized to practice F-C expression regarding contro- versial topics.

The S/S procedure used the seven-day program given in Appen- dix B but spent two days on each one day's activities, rather than just one.

Unstructured/structured treatment

This procedure utilized the unstructured procedure, as described above, for seven days. On the eighth day, the group switched to the seven-day structured procedure given in Appendix B.

Structured/unstructured treatment

This procedure utilized the seven-day structured procedure given in Appendix B. On the eighth day, the group switched to the unstructured procedure described above.

Measurement and Scoring

The testing materials used (pre, mid, post) in this study are given in Appendix D. Other data were obtained from the patients as part of the intake battery (MMPI, two WAIS subscales, Buss-Durkee Hostility Scale, Bates-Zimmerman Constriction Scale) but will not be included in the discussion of this project.

Measurement of treatment goals

The achievement of treatment goals was assessed utilizing inventories developed specifically for this project. Their respective reliabilities are as yet undetermined.

F-C identification. The first treatment goal, the ability to identify feeling words, was measured using the Feeling Word Identification Inventory (FWII, Appendix D, p. 143) consisting of 30 words. Fifteen

of these words are feeling words taken from the Word List for

Description of Feelings (WLDF, Appendix C, p. 128); 15 are nonfeeling

words. The test score represents the total number of correct dis-

criminations out of a possible 30.

F-C expression. The second treatment goal, the ability to use

F-C statements, was measured using the "Self" Feeling Expression

Inventory (SFEI, Appendix D, p. 144), consisting of two roleplay scripts

and instructions to write down the feelings and the associated causes

each person would experience if actually encountering such situations.

This instrument was scored using the method described in the Scoring

Manual for Feeling-Cause Statements (Appendix E) and the Additional

Scoring Notes: "Self" Feeling Expression Inventory (Appendix F,

p. 171).

Using the SFEI roleplay situation designed to elicit negative feel-

ings, each of four psychology graduate student raters divided the writ-

ten responses into scorable phrases according to the scoring manual.

The number of such phrases comprised the variable "frequency of

scorable responses." The words in these phrases were counted and

made up the nondistracting word count. All other words were con-

sidered distracting information. The number of nondistracting words

divided by the total number of words given on the page comprised the

variable "percent of nondistracting words."

Next, the following weights were assigned to the scoring

categories given in the scoring manual and each phrase was scored:

1. I feel = 1
2. Unclear feeling = 3
3. Clear feeling = 8
4. Unclear cause = 2
5. Clear cause = 10
6. Unclear connection = 1
7. Clear connection = 2

These weights were determined in order to provide the rankings given in Table 5 of the various types of statements it is possible to make. The score for any statement was the sum of its component weights.

The highest score obtained on any phrase comprised the variable "maximum score" and the lowest score the variable "minimum score." Finally, the sum of scores on all phrases divided by the number of scorable phrases comprised the variable "average quality of scorable responses." A similar procedure was performed on the positive feeling script. Inter-rater reliability coefficients for the four raters are given for each variable in Table 6, collapsing across positive and negative scripts and pre-mid-post testing periods. These reliabilities were considered adequate to justify computing the final SFEI data as the average of the four raters' scores. The total word count of the response comprised the final SFEI variable.

F-C recognition. The third treatment goal, the ability to identify F-C statements in the speech of others, was measured using the

Table 5

Scoring of F-C Statements

Category	Example	Score
I feel	I feel that you should not have come late.	1
UF	I disagree with you.	3
UF-UC-Ucon	You wrongly came late. I disagree with that.	6
UF-UC-Ccon	I disagree with your wrongly coming late.	7
CF	I am unhappy.	8
CF-UC-Ucon	You wrongly came late. I am unhappy about that.	11
CF-UC-Ccon	I am unhappy with your wrongly coming late.	12
UF-CC-Ucon	You came late. I disagree with that.	14
UF-CC-Ccon	I disagree with your coming late.	15
CF-CC-Ucon	You came late. I am unhappy about that.	19
CF-CC-Ccon	I am unhappy that you came late.	20

Note.--UF = Unclear feeling; UC = Unclear cause; Ucon = Unclear connection; CF = Clear feeling; CC = Clear cause; Ccon = Clear connection.

Table 6

SFEI Inter-Rater Reliabilities

Variables	Coefficients
Percent of nondistracting words	.82
Frequency of scorable responses	.91
Average quality of scorable responses	.89
Maximum score	.88
Minimum score	.89

"Other" Feeling Expression Inventory (Appendix D, p. 146), consist-
ing of two roleplay scripts with sample expressor statements and
instructions to write down the feelings and the associated causes being
experienced by the script expressor. This instrument was scored
using the method described in the Scoring Manual for the "Other" Feel-
ing Expression Inventory (Appendix G) and gave an "Other" Feeling
Expression score for each of the positive and negative scripts. The
inter-rater reliability coefficient, collapsing across the positive and
negative scripts, was .91. Again the final OFEI data were computed
as the average of the four raters' scores.

All scoring for the "Self" and "Other" inventories was done blind
with respect to experimental condition and whether the test scored was
obtained at the pre-, mid-, or post-testing period.

Measurement of affect

Depression scores were obtained during the pre-mid-post written
testing sessions using the Zung Depression Scale (Zung, 1965; Appen-
dix D, p. 148). Other affect measures were obtained using an interview
method devised by Gottschalk and Gleser (1969). An interview was
conducted (pre-mid-post) by a female psychology graduate student who
was unknown to the group participants. The following introduction was
given by her to each group member:

> Mr. X, I am Paula Caplan, a representative of the V.A. Central
> Office. We are interested in studying the speaking and conversa-
> tional habits of V.A. patients, and are, therefore, asking to speak

very briefly with many V.A. patients. I would like to record our conversation, if you don't mind, so that I can remember what you say. We will be talking about five minutes. (STARTS RECORDER)

As I said, this is a study of speaking and conversational habits. Upon a signal from me I would like you to speak for five minutes about any interesting or dramatic personal life experience you have had. Once you have started I will be here listening to you, but I would prefer not to reply to any questions you may feel like asking me until the five-minute period is over. Do you have any questions you would like to ask me now before we start? (ANSWERS ANY QUESTIONS BY REPEATING INSTRUCTIONS)

Well, then, you may begin. (STARTS WATCH) . . . (5 MIN.)
Thank you, Mr. X. That was fine.

No group participant knew that the interview had anything to do with their group therapy. The interviewer had no knowledge of the experimental design nor the specific therapy group attended by any given patient.

Transcripts of these interviews were sent to the University of Cincinnati Medical School, where they were scored by C. Winget using the content analysis procedure devised by Gottschalk, Winget, and Gleser (1969). This scoring was also done without information regarding the experimental condition or testing period of any transcript. The affect scales of anxiety, hostility outward-overt, hostility outward-covert, hostility inward, hostility ambivalent, and human relatedness were obtained in this manner.

Various studies by Gottschalk and Gleser (1969) have suggested that reliable indices of affect can be obtained using three to five speech samples from a given person obtained within a limited period of time. The use of only one sample has undetermined reliability. The reader

is referred to the 1969 book for a comprehensive discussion of the theoretical assumptions and scoring underlying the content analysis procedure. Only those points dealing with the description, scoring reliability, and validity of each scale will be summarized here.

Anxiety. The type of anxiety being measured by Gottschalk and Gleser is what might be termed "free" anxiety in contrast to "bound" anxiety, which "manifests itself in conversion and hypochondriacal symptoms, in compulsions, in doing and undoing, in withdrawal from human relationships, and so forth." Subcategories of anxiety include: death, mutilation, separation, guilt, shame, and diffuse or nonspecific anxiety. The scale is intended to measure immediate, labile anxiety in contrast to trait-type instruments, such as the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. Scoring reliability for the Total Anxiety Score computed on the results of two independent judges scoring responses made by psychiatric inpatients (N = 65) was .84.

Validity studies have yielded the following intercorrelations: .78 (Gottschalk & Frank, 1967) with the Overall-Gorham Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (Overall & Gorham, 1962); .66 with the average clinical rating of two psychiatrists (Gottschalk & Gleser, 1969); .65 with acute anxiety as defined by the Wittenborn Psychiatric Rating Scale (Wittenborn, 1955); .51 with the MMPI psychasthenia scale; .68 with the Welsh A Factor anxiety scores; .41 with the total IPAT anxiety scale (Cattell & Scheier, 1961); and -.35

with the emotional stability scale of Cattell's 16PF (Cattell & Eber, 1957).

It was expected that this measure would be suitably sensitive to changes that might occur over a seven-day period as a result of treatment. Successful training in F-C expression was hypothesized to reduce an individual's experience of anxiety.

Hostility. The construct of hostility, as pointed out by Gottschalk and Gleser (1969), is a global one embracing many conceptually different factors: (a) a behavioral act called "aggression"; (b) a self-reported attitude of dislike, resentment, or suspicion, sometimes called "hostility"; (c) a subjective experience of an affect called "anger"; or (d) a dispositional or potential state toward "hostility" or "aggression." Any particular measure may focus on one or more of these aspects, often without explicit indication by the investigator. The concept of hostility directed toward the self, also called "hostility inward," is likewise frequently undefined or confused. This ambiguity has resulted in inconsistent findings in studies aimed at measuring "aggression" or "hostility."

The Gottschalk-Gleser method focuses on "the anger portion of the hostility concept," distinguishing between hostility directed away from the self (Outward), hostility directed toward the self (Inward), and ambivalently directed hostility. Outward hostility measures the

intensity of "adversely critical, angry, assaultive, asocial impulses."

Inward hostility measures degrees of "self-hate and self-criticism

and, to some extent, feelings of anxious depression and masochism."

The ambivalent hostility scale is derived from communications sug-

gesting "destructive and critical thoughts or actions of others to the

self." Outward hostility is further differentiated into Overt and Covert.

Scoring reliability studies computed on the results of two independent

judges' scoring responses made by psychiatric inpatients have yielded:

> .79 for Hostility Outward (Overt);
> .98 for Hostility Outward (Covert);
> .93 for Total Hostility Outward;
> .96 for Ambivalent Hostility; and
> .91 for Hostility Inward.

A variety of validation studies have been conducted with the hos-

tility measures. Hostility directed outward was found to be inter-

correlated highly with self-report measures assessing assaultive and

angry feelings, and observer measures assessing harmful, asocial,

and destructive behavior and attitudes toward external objects. It was

found dissimilar to a variety of measures of concepts labeled "hostility,

depression, indirect hostility, suspicion, and negativism."

Hostility Inward was found to be a similar construct to other

psychological constructs of depression, as measured by adjective check-

lists, the "depression" and "acute anxiety" scores derived from the

Wittenborn rating scales (Wittenborn, 1955), and the scores obtained

from the Beck depression inventory (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, &

Erbaugh, 1961) and the Gottschalk-Gleser clinical depression scale.

It was hypothesized that the learning of appropriate F-C expression of anger would reduce each of these hostility measures.

Human relatedness. This scale was the first to attempt to quantify an individual's degree of "interest in and his capacity for constructive, mutually productive, or satisfying human relationships." It has not been developed to the extent of the other affect scales as yet. However, a preliminary investigation of scoring reliability yielded an interrater correlation of .85.

Correlation studies with the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Edwards, 1954) resulted in the following relationships: .36 with the affiliation scale; .53 with the nurturance scale; and .36 with the succorance scale.

It was hypothesized that ability to use F-C expression would result in an increase in feelings of human relatedness.

Depression. In addition to the Hostility Inward Scale, depression was assessed utilizing the Zung Depression Scale (Zung, 1965), a measure developed on a V.A. psychiatric population. It is composed of 20 items representing "the most commonly found characteristics" of depression. Scoring is objective. Validation studies have shown it to correlate reliably with other more time-consuming depression rating scales (Zung, Richards, & Short, 1965).

Improved F-C expression was expected to be associated with a decrease in depression.

Measurement of behav: generalization

The interviews obtained for the Gottschalk-Gleser affect assessment were also scored for F-C statements by our F-C scorers, utilizing the scoring manual in Appendix E and the Additional Notes for Scoring F-C Statements: Interviews in Appendix F. The same six variables as given for the "Self" inventory were computed. The inter-rater reliabilities for five of the six variables are given in Table 7, collapsing across pre-mid-post testing sessions. The sixth variable was total word count.

Table 7

Interview Inter-Rater Reliabilities

Variables	Coefficients
Percent of nondistracting words	.77
Frequency of scorable responses	.94
Average quality of scorable responses	.65
Maximum score	.65
Minimum score	.65

Lower reliabilities for the interview data resulted from the

increased difficulty in scoring speech samples over answers to the
written "Self" inventory, as well as reported fatigue on the part of the
scorers, who did the interview scoring last. These reliability coeffi-
cients were considered sufficiently adequate, however, to justify com-
puting final scores for each subject by averaging the scores of the four
raters. The scoring was done blind with respect to experimental condi-
tion and testing period. It provided a measure of generalization of F-C
expression to a new situation external to the treatment setting.

Summary

Table 8 contains a summary of the dependent measures for the
study. These variables were utilized in the following way:

A. Measurement of treatment goals.

    1. Ability to identify feeling words (variable 1).

    2. Ability to use F-C statements (variables 2-13).

    3. Ability to recognize F-C statements (variables 14-15).

B. Measurement of affect (variables 16-22).

C. Measurement of behavior generalization (variables 23-28).

Table 8

Summary of Dependent Measures

Measure	Source
1. Feeling identification score	FWII
2. Percent of nondistracting words: positive situation	SFEI
3. Frequency of scorable responses: positive situation	SFEI
4. Average quality of scorable responses: positive situation	SFEI
5. Maximum score: positive situation	SFEI
6. Minimum score: positive situation	SFEI
7. Total word count: positive situation	SFEI
8. Percent of nondistracting words: negative situation	SFEI
9. Frequency of scorable responses: negative situation	SFEI
10. Average quality of scorable responses: negative situation	SFEI
11. Maximum score: negative situation	SFEI
12. Minimum score: negative situation	SFEI
13. Total word count: negative situation	SFEI
14. "Other" Feeling Expression score: positive situation	OFEI
15. "Other" Feeling Expression score: negative situation	OFEI
16. Anxiety score	Gottschalk-Gleser
17. Hostility Outward - Overt score	Gottschalk-Gleser

Table 8 (continued)

Measure	Source
18. Hostility Outward - Covert score	Gottschalk-Gleser
19. Hostility Inward score	Gottschalk-Gleser
20. Hostility Ambivalent score	Gottschalk-Gleser
21. Total Human Relations score	Gottschalk-Gleser
22. Zung Depression score	Zung Depression Scale
23. Percent of nondistracting words	Interview
24. Frequency of scorable responses	Interview
25. Average quality of scorable responses	Interview
26. Maximum score	Interview
27. Minimum score	Interview
28. Total word count	Interview

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Evaluation of Therapist Training

A t test was computed between the means for the percent of time
occupied by therapist speech in the unstructured (M = 28.43%) and
structured (M = 44.04%) sessions. As hypothesized, the therapists
talked a significantly greater amount of time during the structured ses-
sions (t = 7.02, p < .01).

To evaluate the hypothesized relationship between amount of
structure and therapist behavior, a two-factor analysis of variance was
computed with repeated measures on one factor. Factor A represented
the unstructured versus structured dimension, while the repeated mea-
sures factor B represented the two scoring categories 4-6 (giving sug-
gestion, evaluation, and orientation) and 7-9 (asking for suggestion,
evaluation, and orientation). As hypothesized: (a) a significant AB
interaction effect was found and (b) inspection of individual means
showed the sum of categories 4-6 to be greater for structured sessions
and the sum of categories 7-9 to be greater for unstructured sessions.
The results of this analysis are given in Table 9.

Table 9

Analysis of Variance of Therapist Behavior Ratings

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between subjects	1,558.04	29			
A (Structured type)	.19	1	.19	.003	N.S.
S (A) Error	1,557.85	28	55.64		
Within subjects	6,223.69	30			
B (Scoring category)	.72	1	.72	.010	N.S.
AB	4,118.47	1	4,118.47	54.80	.01
S (A) B Error	2,104.51	28	75.16		

Data Reduction

The first step in the data analysis involved reduction of the original 28 variables,[1] utilizing an automatic analytic factor analysis program developed by Cattel and Meurle (1960) called Max Plane. The program gives an oblique simple structure solution and is unique in maximizing the hyperplane count, rather than using a cosine-related criterion for the solution. The results of the factor solution, which yielded five factor scores from the original 28 variables, are given in Appendix H. Each of the pre-, mid-, and post-testing variable sets were factored separately to ensure that the factor structure remained stable over the three testing periods. Although some variability is noted in the individual loadings from one time to the next, the identification of the five factors remained the same in each factoring. Therefore, the alpha loadings derived from the pre scores were taken as the basic factor structure and were used to compute factor scores for the pre-, mid-, and post-testings,[2] using the complete method of Harman (Harman, 1960). The items identifying each factor, along with their factor loadings, are given in Table 10. The factors were identified as follows:

---

[1] This was done to reduce the number of variables relative to the number of subjects (N = 45) and make statistical analysis possible.

[2] There is as yet no statistical test of the comparability of factor structures.

Table 10

Item Content and Factor Loadings of the Factor Structure

Factor	Text of Item	Factor Loading
1	Average quality - self - negative	0.905
1	Maximum score - self - negative	0.828
1	Minimum score - self - negative	0.811
1	% Non-distractors - self - negative	0.794
1	Total score - other - negative	0.481
2	Total word count - self - positive	0.778
2	Total word count - self - negative	0.708
2	F of scorable responses - self - positive	0.672
2	F of scorable responses - self - negative	0.608
3	Ambivalent hostility	-0.780
3	Hostility directed outward - overt	-0.599
3	Anxiety - total	-0.514
3	Total human relatedness	0.513
3	Minimum score - interview	0.420
3	Hostility directed outward - covert	-0.406

Table 10 (continued)

Factor	Text of Item	Factor Loading
4	Average quality - self - positive	-1.033
4	Maximum score - self - positive	-0.941
4	Minimum score - self - positive	-0.823
4	% Non-distractors - self - positive	-0.737
5	Maximum score - interview	0.826
5	F of scorable responses - interview	0.724
5	Average quality of response - interview	0.466
5	% Non-distractors - interview	0.452
5	Hostility directed inward	0.407
5	Total score - other - positive	0.376
5	Zung depression	0.333
5	Feeling identification test	0.284
5	Total word count - interview	0.277

1. Negative Feeling Expression

2. Amount of Verbal Output

3. Affect

4. Positive Feeling Expression

5. Generalization of F-C Expression

Although it was not necessarily expected, the identification of the various factors matches the previously discussed logic of the measurement domain: (a) ability to express positive feelings, (b) ability to express negative feelings, (c) affect, and (d) generalization of F-C expression.   The fifth factor (number 2 in Table 10) represents a verbal style factor, namely, amount of verbal output.

Table 11 presents the correlations among the primary factor vectors.   The significance of each correlation coefficient in Table 11 was tested, using the distribution of $\underline{t}$ [$t = r \times \sqrt{\dfrac{N-2}{1-r^2}}$] with N - 2 degrees of freedom (Ferguson, 1971).   Only the correlation between Negative Feeling Expression and Generalization of F-C Expression was significant at the .05 level.   The remaining factors were orthogonal.

Factor one contains four out of the six[1] scores representing F-C expression in the situation eliciting negative feelings plus the score indicating the ability to identify such feelings and their associated causes in the speech of others.   Hence, it is labeled "Negative Feeling

---

[1]The other two scores, total word count and $\underline{f}$ of scorable responses, represent more of an output factor (see factor two).

Table 11

Correlations Among the Primary Factors

	1	2	3	4	5
1	1.000	-0.063	0.006	-0.231	0.325
2		1.000	-0.000	0.193	-0.201
3			1.000	0.064	0.121
4				1.000	-0.064
5					1.000

Expression." Factor two contains four out of the five scores representing amount of verbal output.[1] It is considered to be a stylistic parameter independent of the quality of that output, and is labeled "Amount of Verbal Output." Factor three contains five out of the seven[2] scores representing affect and, hence, is labeled "Affect." The hostility and anxiety scores are negatively correlated with the total human relatedness score, indicating that the more anxious and hostile the patients felt, the less related to people they felt. Factor four contains four of the six[3] scores representing F-C expression in the situation eliciting positive feelings and is thus labeled "Positive Feeling Expression." Finally, factor five contains all six of the scores representing F-C expression in the interview situation plus both measures of depression, the feeling identification test, and the score representing ability to identify positive feelings in the speech of others. Since these last four measures had lower factor loadings, they were not included in the naming of the factor--"Generalization of F-C Expression."

Means and standard deviations for each factor score were

---

[1] The other score is total word count for the interview.

[2] The other two affect measures, hostility directed inward and depression, appear to be more related to interview performance in these data (see factor five).

[3] Again, the other two scores, total word count and _f_ of scorable responses, represent more of an output factor (see factor two).

computed for the three testing periods of each experimental condition. The values are given in Table 12 in standard score form, using the T transformation $[T = 50 + 10 \frac{(X - M)}{s}]$ computed from all scores on a single factor.

Treatment Differences

As previously discussed, the September patients comprising groups U/U and S/S were matched according to a number of variables and then randomly assigned, one member from each pair, into the two treatment groups. The results from these two training groups comprised Experiment I. A similar procedure was used to assign the November patients into groups U/S and S/U, which comprised Experiment II.

Although it is most desirable to be able to compare groups both within and between experiments, two cautions are warranted. First, while a matched group design provides maximum power for analysis within each experiment, comparisons across experiments require random or matched assignment of patients into all four groups at the same time. This was impossible in the present study due to the lack of availability of a sufficient number of patients at any given time and the inability of the same group of therapists to run four groups simultaneously. Therefore, the groups were run in pairs (U/U - S/S and U/S - S/U). However, this procedure violates the assumption of four-group random

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations of Factor Scores for the Three
Testing Periods of Each Experimental Condition

			I Negative Feeling Expression			II Amount of Verbal Output	
Group		Pre	Mid	Post	Pre	Mid	Post
U/U	Mean	52.37	45.43	44.57	48.70	49.60	42.23
	SD	7.98	11.22	7.58	8.89	12.21	10.30
S/S	Mean	50.87	54.82	54.44	50.23	51.48	53.71
	SD	13.13	8.59	6.68	9.68	11.57	7.24
U/S	Mean	50.12	46.40	47.45	50.52	48.85	49.36
	SD	8.62	8.86	12.89	10.26	9.66	12.49
S/U	Mean	47.86	51.91	51.80	50.12	50.05	52.07
	SD	9.98	9.95	9.40	11.55	8.55	7.43

Factors

III Affect			IV Positive Feeling Expression			V Generalization of F-C Expression		
Pre	Mid	Post	Pre	Mid	Post	Pre	Mid	Post
51.34	47.32	51.40	45.92	51.81	53.20	50.42	52.27	53.08
7.03	11.82	7.26	13.33	13.44	5.23	9.10	15.59	14.68
49.17	52.19	52.22	52.41	46.91	46.76	52.51	49.85	47.14
7.56	7.61	10.20	3.32	7.90	6.17	10.50	9.03	7.49
48.12	45.82	44.83	53.79	54.72	53.78	54.25	51.52	51.26
9.89	4.45	10.71	6.82	5.96	9.60	7.11	9.96	10.31
51.50	53.40	51.88	47.19	47.36	47.47	44.14	47.52	49.40
13.34	12.84	9.96	12.57	11.18	13.46	10.35	7.00	8.65

or matched assignment required in comparisons across experiments.

Secondly, groups in the two experiments vary on three dimensions: (a) time of year being conducted; (b) number of therapists conducting the groups (five in September, four in November); and (c) patients available for group assignment. Thus, the analysis of the data will be presented in three sections: (a) Experiment I (U/U versus S/S), (b) Experiment II (U/S versus S/U), and (c) a final comparison of all four training groups. Analyses for Experiments I and II will utilize a matched group analysis of variance, while that of the four group comparisons will utilize an analysis of variance assuming random assignment. Conclusions from the latter analysis are subject to the cautions given above.

Within each section, results will be presented to demonstrate the equality of the groups being compared with respect to the matching variables. In addition, results will be presented for each factor score for the following change (difference) scores: (a) Pre-Mid (P-M); (b) Mid-Post (M-Pt); and (c) Pre-Post (P-Pt).

. Table 13 shows the means and standard deviations of the factor change scores for each experimental condition.

Because of the nature of the study, data are available on only a small number of patients for each group. In the following sections, results will be presented with regard not only to those analyses reaching significance but also those analyses suggestive of trends toward

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations of Factor Change Scores
for Each Experimental Condition

			Factors				
		I Negative Feeling Expression			II Amount of Verbal Output		
Group		P-M	M-Pt	P-Pt	P-M	M-Pt	P-Pt
U/U	Mean	6.94	0.86	7.80	-0.90	7.37	6.47
	SD	12.83	15.43	10.02	9.60	17.93	11.79
S/S	Mean	-3.95	0.38	-3.57	-1.25	-2.23	-3.48
	SD	17.11	9.40	10.59	11.80	13.91	11.16
U/S	Mean	3.71	-1.05	2.67	1.67	-0.52	1.15
	SD	10.81	15.74	15.37	15.08	16.25	13.17
S/U	Mean	-4.05	0.11	-3.94	0.06	-2.02	-1.95
	SD	8.33	10.12	9.42	14.06	8.33	12.26

Note. --P-M = Pre-Mid; M-Pt = Mid-Post; P-Pt = Pre-Post.

III Affect			IV Positive Feeling Expression			V Generalization of F-C Expression		
P-M	M-Pt	P-Pt	P-M	M-Pt	P-Pt	P-M	M-Pt	P-Pt
4.02	-4.09	-0.06	-5.89	-1.39	-7.28	-1.85	-0.80	-2.65
12.83	12.24	9.08	16.98	15.56	16.25	14.93	18.35	16.73
-3.01	-0.04	-3.05	5.50	0.14	5.64	2.66	2.71	5.37
11.81	11.91	9.12	8.71	9.84	5.66	11.30	12.49	7.43
2.30	0.98	3.28	-8.92	0.93	-6.01	2.73	0.25	2.99
9.63	11.46	12.10	10.24	9.82	10.15	13.20	11.65	11.99
-1.91	1.52	-0.38	-0.16	-0.12	-0.28	-3.38	-1.88	-5.26
19.62	8.44	19.08	16.02	9.88	20.88	10.12	8.74	13.67

significance, in order not to discard possible effects that might have been statistically significant had there been larger numbers of patients in each group. $\underline{F}$ ratios and associated alpha levels will be given for any analysis yielding a $\underline{p}$ value of less than .20. Analyses yielding $\underline{p}$ values between .05 and .10 will be considered marginally significant.

Experiment I

Since the factor change score analyses were to be matched group comparisons, only those pairs represented in both groups could be used. Therefore, three patients were eliminated from the $\underline{S/S}$ group, leaving eight participants in each group. For each of the interval scale matching variables given in Table 1, i.e., age, estimated verbal IQ, years of education, number of previous hospitalizations, and number of days of current admission, $\underline{t}$ tests were computed between the $\underline{U/U}$ and $\underline{S/S}$ groups. All comparisons yielded nonsignificant results. For each of the ordinal scale matching variables given in Tables 2, 3, and 4, i.e., marital status, diagnostic category, and medication, a Chi Square analysis was computed between the same groups. These comparisons also yielded totally nonsignificant findings. Finally, a two-group step-wise discriminant function analysis was performed using all eight matching variables. Even allowing for the interactions between variables with this analysis, it was not possible to discriminate significantly between the two groups. Therefore, the groups were considered

equivalent with respect to matching variables.

Table 14 presents matched group analysis of variance F ratios for each factor change score between groups U/U and S/S. [1]

Examination of the individual means showed that for factor score I the S/S group showed greater improvement, while for factor scores IV and V the U/U group showed the greater improvement.

Experiment II

Again only pairs were to be used in the factor change score analyses between the U/S and S/U groups. Thus, two patients were dropped from the S/U group, leaving an N of 12 in each group. The univariate and discriminant function analysis tests described for Experiment I were also conducted between these groups. All tests were nonsignificant. Therefore, these groups were also considered equivalent with respect to the matching variables.

Table 15 presents the matched group analysis of variance F ratios for each factor change score between groups U/S and S/U. [2]

Examination of the individual means showed that for factor score I the S/U group showed the greater improvement, while for factor score IV the U/S group showed the greater improvement.

---

[1] Complete Analysis of Variance tables are given in Appendix I (Tables 17 and 18) for those F ratios having p values between .05 and .10.

[2] Complete Analysis of Variance tables are given in Appendix I (Tables 19-21) for those F ratios having p values between .05 and .10.

Table 14

U/U versus S/S Analysis of Variance F Ratios
for Each Factor Change Score

			Factors		
Change Scores	I Negative Feeling Expression	II Amount of Verbal Output	III Affect	IV Positive Feeling Expression	V Generalization of F-C Expression
Pre-Mid	2.26 (<.17)	N.S.	N.S.	2.03 (<.20)	N.S.
Mid-Post	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Pre-Post	3.57* (<.10)	N.S.	N.S.	5.56* (<.05)	2.30 (<.17)

Note.--N.S. = $p > .20$; * = $p < .10$.

Table 15

U/S versus S/U Analysis of Variance F Ratios
for Each Factor Change Score

	Factors				
Change Scores	I Negative Feeling Expression	II Amount of Verbal Output	III Affect	IV Positive Feeling Expression	V Generalization of F-C Expression
Pre--Mid	3.33* (<.10)	N.S.	N.S.	3.77* (<.08)	N.S.
Mid--Post	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Pre--Post	3.03* (<.10)	N.S.	N.S.	2.60 (<.14)	N.S.

Note.--N.S. = $p > .20$; * = $p < .10$.

Four-group comparison

The appropriate analysis of variance, Chi Square, and step-wise discriminant function analyses were conducted on the matching variables comparing all four training groups. In this instance all of the original data could be used. The analysis of variance on the age variable showed the U/U patients to be significantly younger (M = 30) than the U/S (M = 44) and S/U (M = 43) patients, who were not significantly different from one another. All other univariate tests, however, were nonsignificant. Because the discriminant analysis was also nonsignificant, the four groups were considered equivalent with respect to the matching variables.

The four-group analysis was composed of the following new comparisons: U/U - U/S, S/S - U/S, U/U - S/U, and S/S - S/U. Table 16[1] gives the analysis of variance F ratios for these comparisons for each factor change score.

Individual contrast effects were computed to determine those specific comparisons contributing to the significant F ratios. For factor score I the S/U group showed greater improvement than the U/U group and the S/S group showed greater improvement than the U/S group. For factor score V the S/U group showed greater improvement than the S/S group.

---

[1]Complete Analysis of Variance table is given in Appendix I (Table 22) for the F ratio having a p value between .05 and .10.

Table 16

Four-Group Analysis of Variance $\underline{F}$ Ratios
for Each Factor Change Score

| Change Scores | Factors | | | | |
	I Negative Feeling Expression	II Amount of Verbal Output	III Affect	IV Positive Feeling Expression	V Generalization of F-C Expression
Pre-Mid	2.08 (<.12)	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Mid-Post	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Pre-Post	2.28* (<.09)	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	1.82 (<.16)

Note.--N.S. = p > .20; * = p < .10.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Evidence for Hypotheses

Previous literature has generally supported the use of more
structured procedures in training a variety of expressive skills (Fried-
man, 1971; Hedquist & Weinhold, 1970; Kirwin, Damgaard, & Gentry,
1973; Lazarus, 1966; Lomont et al., 1969; McFall & Lillesand, 1971;
McFall & Marston, 1970; Rathus, 1972, 1973). The techniques used
in the structured program for this study have been found to be espe-
cially effective, i.e., modeling, directed roleplaying, improvised
roleplaying (Friedman, 1971) and performance feedback (McFall &
Marston, 1970). However, no study, to the author's knowledge, has
attempted to evaluate the use of combined structured and unstructured
procedures in such training. Therefore, previously stated hypotheses
of this study regarding F-C expression, affect, and generalization of
F-C expression predicted that groups involving structured training
would be more effective than the entirely unstructured group, but did
not make specific predictions regarding relative ordering of the entirely
structured and two-combination groups.

Results for the Negative Feeling Expression factor are consistent with the literature favoring structure. In general, groups using more structure showed significantly greater improvement at the .10 level (S/S > U/U; S/S > U/S; and S/U > U/U). Even on the pre-mid measure, after seven days of training, the groups beginning with structured activity evidenced consistent trends toward greater effectiveness than groups beginning with unstructured activity (S/S > U/U; S/U > U/S; S/U > U/U; and S/S > U/S). In addition, the S/U group was found to be significantly more effective than the U/S group (p < .10) and not significantly different from the S/S group, supporting the previously hypothesized advantage of a procedure which first uses structured activity for training F-C expression and then allows some time for practice in a more unstructured format.

Results for the Positive Feeling Expression factor were in direct opposition to the expected superiority of the structured procedures. The U/U group was significantly more effective than the S/S group at the .05 level. In addition, after seven days of training, two groups beginning with unstructured activity evidenced trends toward greater effectiveness than two groups beginning with structured activity (U/U > S/S and U/S > S/U), adding support to the potential superiority of unstructured procedures for training the expression of positive feeling.

Two explanations for the unexpected results are suggested.

First, it is a common finding in encounter group literature that considerable effort is needed in unstructured groups to get group members to violate social norms and engage in new behavior (Ballard, 1972). Since the expression of negative feelings is usually less socially comfortable than the expression of positive feelings, it seems possible that the unstructured groups may have spent more time on the practice of positive expression. The interaction between amount of structure and type of feeling being learned might then represent a practice effect, with the unstructured groups having practiced more with positive feelings and the structured groups more with negative feelings. The data from this study, however, do not permit a direct assessment of this issue.

A second possibility may involve the order of training in the structured procedures. Since the training for expression of negative feeling always occurred first, the group participants may have experienced the primacy effect found commonly in the learning literature, i.e., where the first information presented is usually learned most effectively (Kimble, 1961).

Of course, the data of the present study support the possibility that there may be an interaction effect between structure and type of feeling expression being trained. Such a relationship could explain the conflict between previous findings favoring structured activity versus those favoring unstructured activity, if the respective studies have been

based primarily on the type of feeling expression for which the data

of the present study show them to be most suitable. In fact, many of

the assertive trainers do tend to focus more on the expression of nega-

tive feelings (Lazarus, 1973), while the studies of Rogers and his

colleagues supporting unstructured activity (e.g., Rogers & Dymond,

1954) have used primarily positive self-references (increases in self-

concept) as an outcome measure.

Investigators have found that individuals benefit in a variety of

ways from assertive (Hedquist & Weinhold, 1970; Lazarus, 1966;

Lomont et al., 1969; Rathus, 1972, 1973) and affect expression train-

ing (Fein, 1963; Liberman, 1971; Seitz, 1953). Those studies looking

particularly at changes in affect have shown inconsistent results, some

finding decreases in negative affect and/or increases in a sense of

human relatedness (Fein, 1963; Geisinger, 1969; Goldstein et al.,

1970; Kirwin, Damgaard, & Gentry, 1973; Liberman, 1970; Lomont

et al., 1969; Martinson & Zerface, 1970; Patterson et al., 1968;

Rathus, 1972, 1973) and some finding no changes in either (Friedman,

1971; McFall & Marston, 1970). As in these latter studies, the present

results with respect to the Affect factor showed no significant differ-

ences among any of the groups.

One possible reason for the failure to find differences here may

have been that the post-testing speech sample was obtained imme-

diately after the groups ended and before group participants had an

opportunity to use F-C expression in their relationships outside the hospital and thus experience any changes which might have occurred in their affective state as a result of same. Caution is also warranted in interpreting these results, since they are based on only a single speech sample for each testing period, the reliability of which is undetermined. The data from the present study, however, would tend to support the idea that F-C training may not affect more global characteristics, such as those measured by the Gottschalk and Gleser (1969) content analysis method.

No significant differences were found for the Generalization of F-C Expression factor. Only two comparisons yielded p values even suggestive of trends toward differences (U/U > S/S and S/U > S/S). However, both of these comparisons support the idea that procedures ending with unstructured activity may have an advantage over those ending in structured activity. Such a finding could represent an instance of "stimulus generalization" (Kimble, 1961), since the unstructured procedure was probably more like the interview situation than the structured procedure.

No significant differences were predicted and/or found between any of the groups with respect to increases in verbal output.

In summary, the results of the present study suggest the following strategies for future training groups:

1. Given seven days for training and the expression of positive feeling as the objective, an entirely unstructured procedure

may be most effective.

2. Given seven days for training and the expression of negative feeling as the objective, an entirely structured procedure may be most effective.

3. Given 14 days for training and the expression of positive feeling as the objective, a U/U procedure appears to be most effective and may also be more likely to produce generalization of behavior to other less structured situations.

4. Given 14 days for training and the expression of negative feeling as the objective, an S/U procedure may be most effective, since it may produce as much learning as an S/S with the added advantage of increased likelihood of generalization of behavior to other less structured situations.

Methodological Considerations

The present study followed the example of Hedquist and Weinhold (1970) and Liberman (1971) in utilizing as many methodological advantages as possible within the context of a study focusing on a clinical population. Use of primarily the same therapists for each experimental condition, with a careful description and special training for each treatment procedure and subsequent rating of therapist behavior, allowed a more solid basis for attributing any results indicating differences between groups to the experimental conditions themselves, rather than undetermined differences in therapist personality or behavior.

Clear definition of treatment goals allowed a more logical definition of the measurement domain. Gordon Paul (1969) has discussed the criterion problem most effectively in a recent article on methodology in psychotherapy research:

The <u>minimum</u> requirement for any experiment on behavior modification, therefore, is that the dependent variables include change in the clients' distressing behaviors from pretreatment to posttreatment, assessed external to treatment proper. Specific questions may direct assessments to other time periods, or to additional dependent variables; however, the importance and relevance of any other variable or procedure for behavior modification research must be a function of its relationship to this change.

There are, of course, two ways to make such outcome measures relevant to the "distressing behaviors" of the group participants. One method involves a separate program for each group member tailored specifically to his presenting problems. The second is to identify one or more problems common to all group members for specification as the treatment goal. The latter approach was utilized in the present study.

Further cautions were taken in the manner used to collect and score the data. Many methodologists have written about the problems of self-report data (social desirability, familiarization with the instrument, lack of self-knowledge, expectancy to change phenomena) and the need for behavioral measurement (Paul, 1969). In keeping with this philosophy, the majority of measures in the study were obtained through the scoring of behavioral data, thus minimizing self-report biases. In addition, all interviewing and scoring was done blind with respect to experimental condition and testing period to prevent possible bias. Observers and scorers were carefully trained and the reliabilities of their ratings were determined to insure dependable data.

Finally, following the example of McFall and Marston (1970), an unobtrusive in-vivo test was used to gain information regarding the generalization of trained behavior to a new setting.

The design of the present study allowed a comparison of different training programs, to begin to assess relative effectiveness, rather than just effectiveness compared against a placebo-type control. Use of matched groups of patients allowed a more powerful type of statistical analysis of the data and is important with groups requiring small numbers, where the assumptions of equality through random assignment may be more tenuous. An additional but related problem with such small N's involves the need to collect a lot of data, which ordinarily then makes statistical analysis inappropriate due to the relative size of the N's and the number of variables. This problem was handled in the present study by using a factor analytic model to first reduce the data and then making subsequent analyses on factor scores. A final related problem is the need with such small N's to have large changes in order to reach significance, thus increasing the likelihood of missing trends in the data that might have been significant if greater numbers of patients could have been used. In the present study the alpha level considered to be marginally significant was raised to .10 to allow for this problem.

It is also important to note what this study was not attempting to investigate. The population studied was that of the psychiatric patients

at the Durham, N. C. V.A. Hospital. Consequently, the results cannot be generalized to other populations without further research.

The aim of this study was to compare four gross treatment methods designed to train F-C expression and evaluate their effects on affect and behavior generalization. It was not intended to investigate the other assumptions noted in the Introduction regarding the possible benefits of F-C training, nor was it intended to determine which elements of those treatment procedures form the necessary and sufficient components to produce change in F-C expressive behavior.

As many investigators of psychotherapy have now indicated, the ultimate questions to be answered in behavior modification research appear to be: (a) What treatment, (b) administered by whom, is most effective for (c) this individual with (d) that specific problem, under (e) what set of circumstances, and (f) how does it come about? (Kiesler, 1966; Paul, 1967; Bergin & Strupp, 1972) It seems virtually impossible to answer all aspects of this question within a single study. In the present study, no attempt was made to explore the effect of different therapist characteristics, patient characteristics, or process variables.

Finally, the present study did not attempt to answer the question of the maintenance of behavior change in follow-up.

Suggestions for Future Research

Many different avenues of research are possible in the further

exploration of F-C training. First, improvements on the techniques used in the present study are possible: (a) establishment of reliability for the measures assessing the treatment goals (i.e., FIWL, SFEI, OFEI); (b) use of standard roleplay situations to provide a behavioral measure of the treatment goals and some indication of the validity of the written tests (SFEI and OFEI) in relation to actual behavior; (c) easier measurement procedures for rating changes in affect, such as simple ratings by staff members; (d) use of motivation for therapy as an important matching variable (Luborsky et al., 1971); (e) charting of F-C behavior across treatment sessions to determine individual learning curves; and (f) possible use of automated procedures for training to decrease needed staff time (McFall & Marston, 1970; McFall & Lillesand, 1971).

Second, certain additional comparisons are suggested in order to replicate and clarify the results of the present study: (a) use of structured procedures with training in the expression of positive feeling coming first, in order to assess the possible primacy of learning effect mentioned earlier; (b) more careful assessment of patient behavior during unstructured procedures, in order to assess the possible focus on practice of positive feeling expression mentioned earlier; (c) use of follow-up studies to determine the persistence of behavior change and possibly more long-term changes in affect; and (d) assessment of the impact of F-C training on other aspects of

behavior (e.g., self-concept, behavior in a psychiatric interview or with family members).

Finally, many extensions of the present study are suggested to get a clearer idea of the value and impact of F-C training: (a) use of different populations (e.g., college students, hospital staff, teachers, children, couples, parents); (b) examination of the different components of F-C training to isolate the necessary and sufficient techniques for producing most efficient change; (c) examination of other variables that might interact with type of training (e.g., personality characteristics of patients or therapists); and (d) assessment of the other assumptions noted earlier regarding the potential value of F-C training (e.g., in producing reduction in physiological tension, fewer feelings of defensiveness in the opposer, less punishment from the environment, more accommodation from the environment).

Despite only marginally significant results, the present study does point to the problems inevitably encountered in doing behavior modification research and demonstrates possible methodological strategies that can be used to maximize validity of findings in such research. Progress will undoubtedly continue to be difficult, due to the complexity of the process being studied and the amount of time often required to gather data on a small number of subjects. However, the use of rigorous research designs and appropriate analytic procedures should greatly accelerate our understanding.

APPENDIX A

CATEGORIES OF THERAPIST BEHAVIOR[1]

1. Shows solidarity, raises other's status, gives help, reward

2. Shows tension release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction

3. Agrees, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies

4. Gives suggestion, direction, implying autonomy for other

5. Gives opinion, evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish

6. Gives orientation, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms

7. Asks for orientation, information, repetition, and confirmation

8. Asks for opinion, evaluation, analysis, expression of feeling

9. Asks for suggestion, direction, possible ways of action

10. Disagrees, shows passive rejection, formality, withholds resources

11. Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws out of field

12. Shows antagonism, deflates other's status, defends or asserts self

---

[1]Adapted from Bales (1950).

1. <u>Shows solidarity, raises other's status, gives help, reward:</u>

a. <u>Initial and responsive acts of active solidarity and affection</u>: Includes hailing the other, waving, drawing near him in order to speak, greeting him by saying "hello" or in some other friendly manner, approaching, touching, shaking hands, placing a hand on the shoulder or clapping the other on the back, putting the arm around the other, or linking arms, welcoming the other, extending an invitation to him to be one of the in-group, treating him to food or drink, or some other symbol of solidarity and acceptance. Includes acts in return to a friendly gesture, such as accepting a treat, accepting an offer of help or assistance, thanking the other, accompanying or escorting him, saying or waving "goodbye." Includes any indication of mannerly consideration for the other, any indication of good will, any gesture that indicates that the actor is friendly, congenial, sociable, affiliative, cordial, or informal. A friendly comment on the weather or some other matter of common interest to "break the ice" and start a conversation would belong here. Any act of befriending the other, of showing hospitality, of being neighborly, comradely, is included. The expression of sympathy--"I can see how you feel"--is included. Any indication in the course of interaction that the relationship is becoming more intimate or familiar, as when the actor begins to use the other's first name, or a nickname, or the term "we" where it has not been used before is recorded in this category. Any indication that the actor identifies himself with the other, or confides in him, or entrusts the self to him, is included. Any act of adherence where the actor chooses to be a fellow member with the other, any act of making a covenant, or of forming an alliance, any act of adhering to the other or becoming a partisan on his behalf, is included. Any indication that the actor is attracted to the other, all demonstrations of affection, love, and sexuality, such as acts of courting, flirting, coquetry, embracing, fondling, petting, caressing, kissing, are included.

b. <u>Initial and responsive status-raising acts</u>: Includes all acts which have the specific aim or effect of raising or enhancing the other's status, whether the initial status of the actor is assumed to be higher than that of the other, equal to it, or inferior to it. In situations in which the status of the actor is assumed to be higher, included are praising, rewarding, boosting the other, giving approval or encouragement, or any statement, question, or comment in which the intent is to sustain, reassure, or bolster the status of the other. Examples: "That's fine," "You've done a good job," "Swell," "You've covered a lot of ground today." With regard to situations in which the actor and the other are presumed to be of equal status, included are complimenting, congratulating, showing approval of the other, giving credit to the other, showing enthusiasm for his views, applauding or cheering him. In situations where the actor is assumed to be of inferior status to the other, included are expressing gratitude or appreciation, showing admiration, esteem or respect, wonder, awe or

reverence. Any act which indicates that the actor is attempting to imitate or emulate an admired superior is included. Includes praising, honoring, eulogizing a superior; lauding, acclaiming, extolling, idealizing, paying homage, deifying, adoring, or worshipping the other. The range is thus very great, from comparatively minor degrees of raising the other's status to very extreme recognitions of the other's superior status.

c. In response to Category 11: Includes any behavior in which the actor offers assistance to the other, volunteers, assumes a task or duty on behalf of the other or the group, offers to undertake a job which is indicated by a group decision, offers his services, assists, offers to contribute time, energy, money, or any other resource. Any act of sharing, of distributing something to the other, any giving out of materials, goods or resources of activity, any attempts to make sure that the other is supplied with what he needs, invitations to the other to participate in some satisfaction or reward are included. More neutral or deliberate exchanges of one satisfaction for another, such as trading, paying, or loaning, are included. Any act of bequeathing something or giving a gift to the other is included. Any act of behavior in which the actor defends the other, protects him, acts as a guardian for him, represents or advances his interests, vouches for him, certifies his integrity, speaks for him, advocates his cause, assists him when he is in need, is included. Giving support, reassurance, comfort, consolation, encouragement, the showing of sympathy, pity, compassion, tenderness, expressing condolence and commiseration are included. Attempts to calm the other or assuage some hurt, by feeding him, nursing, healing, gratifying needs of any kind are included. The manifestation of any attitude which the observer interprets as nurturant, gentle, maternal, paternal, benevolent, humanitarian, merciful, charitable is included.

d. In response to Categories 10 and 12: Includes acts which may appear after a situation of difficulty or during a situation of estrangement, such as interceding or mediating, conciliating or moderating a difficulty between two or more others. Acts of pacification, as when the actor mollifies the other, any attempt to allay opposition, to be discreet, tactful, diplomatic, to avoid wounding the other is included. Any act where the actor urges unity or harmony, agreement, cooperation, mutual obligation or expresses other values of solidarity is included. In cases of disagreement or antagonism between two or more others, the suggesting of a compromise by some addition or amendment, expansion or modification of the suggested procedure is included.

2. Shows tension release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction:

a. Spontaneous indications of relief: Includes expressions of feeling better after a period of tension, any manifestation of cheerfulness, buoyance, satisfaction, gratification, contentment, enjoyment, relish, zest, enthusiasm, pleasure, delight, joy, happiness. Positive responses to a compliment, appearing to be charmed, beaming are included. Includes the manifestation of any psychological state which the observer interprets as a diffuse expression of positive affect, any indication that the actor is thrilled, elated, ecstatic, euphoric.

b. Joking: Includes the making of friendly jokes, trying to amuse or entertain; any jovial, jocular, humorous, funny, frivolous, "silly" nonsensical remark, whether spontaneous or as an attempt to smooth over some tension situation. Clowning, bantering, "kidding" the other in a friendly fashion are included. More active "horseplay" or "rough-housing," so long as the element of aggression is not too obviously present, are included. If the element of aggression is present, as it often is, it must be lower than the element of friendliness in the opinion of the observer in order to be marked in this category. If the element of aggression is stronger than the element of friendliness, the act should be scored in Category 12. Similarly, the attempt must indicate some sensitivity to the readiness of others to laugh, otherwise the observer concludes that the actor is excessively ego-involved and places the abortive attempt in Category 11, as an indication of anxiety, or in Category 12, as an indication of status seeking, according to his judgment.

c. Laughing: Positive responses to joking, such as smiling, grinning, giggling, chortling, chuckling, or laughing, are included. With regard to laughs in response to jokes, an arbitrary convention is adopted that with each new "wave" of laughter--essentially each time the person or the group "takes a new breath" and starts laughing again--a new score is entered. In cases where the group as a whole indulges in a general laugh, the score is entered 0-0, even though one or two may not be laughing. These one or two, if noticed, are scored as showing rejection, Category 10.

3. <u>Agrees, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies:</u>

a. <u>In response to Category 1 or 2</u>: Includes any indication to the observer that the actor is modest, humble, respectful, unassertive, retiring.

b. <u>In response to preceding acts of decision in the same category (3)</u>: Includes the kind of final confirmation by repetition or affirmation which one sometimes notices at the end of a difficult process of thinking or discussion, when the actor (or actor and other) appears to come to a decision, to make up his mind, to crystallize his intention, to adopt a plan of action or resolution, and accepts a responsibility to carry it on into overt action. Examples: "Yes, that's it." "That's what I'll do." "Then I guess we're all agreed on that."

c. <u>In response to Category 4</u>: Includes any concurrence in a proposed course of action or assent to a suggestion the other has made. Examples: "I second the motion." "Let's do that." Includes any act (not already classified in Categories 4, 5, or 6, in which the actor either verbally or overtly complies with a request or suggestion, obliges the other, conforms with some direction or desire of the other, cooperates with an order, or does as he has been requested. The carrying out of any activity which has been decided by the group or the other is included. Yielding, obeying, following, or desisting from some activity when requested are included.

d. <u>In response to Category 5</u>: Includes agreement with an observation or report, analysis, or diagnosis which the other has made; that is, belief, confirmation, conviction, or accord about facts, inferences, and hypotheses. Examples: "That's the way I see it too." "I think you are right about that." "Yes, that's true." "Precisely." Similarly includes agreement, approval, or endorsement of an expression of value, feeling, or sentiment. Examples: "I feel the same way you do." "I hope so too." "Those are my sentiments exactly." "That's right."

e. <u>In response to Category 6</u>: Includes giving any sign of recognition, interest, receptiveness, readiness, responsiveness, such as looking at the speaker, sitting erect, or getting into a position to see or hear. Includes giving specific signs of attention to what the other is saying as he goes along, as a means of encouraging him to say what he wishes, by nodding the head, saying "I see," "Yes," "M-hmn"; completing by adding a word the other searches for or is hesitant to say, or otherwise aiding and facilitating communication. Includes showing comprehension, understanding, or insight, after a period of puzzlement and subsequent explanation by the other. Examples: "Oh." "I see." "Yes." "Sure, now I get it."

f. <u>In response to Category 10</u>: Includes admitting an error or oversight, admitting that some objection or disapproval of the other is valid, conceding

a point to the other, giving way, withdrawing politely, asking the other's pardon. Includes introductory phrases which anticipate disagreement of the other and attempt to forestall it by admitting the point in advance. Examples: "Now I may be wrong about this . . ." "This is not an important point perhaps but . . ."

g. In response to Category 11: Includes any indication of a permissive attitude, where the other is led to understand that he is accepted "as he is," so that the incorrectness of his solution to any problem or the quality of his performance does not adversely affect his status, so that he can "make mistakes without blame," and is reassured that he does not need to feel anxious. With regard to the permitting of activity on request of the other, includes all acts in which the actor gives the other freedom to do something, consents to a request, condones, coutenances or legalizes some activity of the other; in which he grants a privilege, abrogates or sets aside a custom or requirement for the other, excuses, forgives, pardons or exonerates the other from the blame of some misdeed. Includes the manifestation of any attitude which the observer interprets as benign, kind, genial, good-natured, indulgent, lenient, forebearing or tolerant. Includes the giving of approval of required work, as in situations where the other must have approval of his work at a given stage before going on to the next stage.

h. In response to Category 12: Includes acts which indicate that the actor is submissive, acquiescent, pliant, meek, in response to aggression directed toward him. Includes allowing the self to be talked down, surrendering, giving in, acknowledging defeat, renouncing a goal or object in favor of the other who demands it, standing aside, taking a back seat, letting the other push by aggressively and have the best. Includes any act in which the actor submits passively, allows himself to be bullied, dispossessed of objects, where he accepts coercion, domination, injury, blame, criticism, censure, punishment with retaliation, rebuttal, rebellion, or complaint.

4. <u>Gives suggestion, direction, implying autonomy for other</u>:

a. <u>The process of cooperative action itself in its conative-instrumental</u>
<u>aspect</u>: Includes all acts which suggest concrete ways of attaining a
desired goal by attacking or modifying the outer situation, or by adapting
activity to it, proposing a solution, indicating or suggesting where to start,
what to do, how to cope with a problem in terms of action in the near
future time perspective.

b. <u>The desired action of the other as the object of conative-instrumental</u>
<u>effort</u>: Includes cases where suggestive orientation is given to the other as
to what kind of activity is expected of him in the immediate future under
some given conditions, as when a client comes into a counseling situation,
or in a situation of instruction or briefing preliminary to cooperative activ-
ity, such as the setting up of a hypothetical example or situation for ex-
ploration or demonstration (such as a role-playing situation) where the
actor proposes or suggests how the situation is to be defined, the purpose
and nature of the roles to be taken, gives instruction or makes proposals
about the task, showing where, when, how, why, something is to be done.
Examples: "We will have to stop at the end of the hour." "Consider for a
moment what would happen if . . ." "Suppose we set up the following situ-
ation . . ." "The foreman in this situation approaches the workman . . ."
"John, will you take the role of the foreman?" "Go right ahead." Includes
direct attempt to guide or to counsel the other regarding some activity, to
prevail upon him, persuade him, exhort him, urge, enjoin or inspire him
to some action. Includes the exercise of routine or established and ac-
cepted control, or control which is exercised in such a way that it is clear
that the right of request rests ultimately on the free consent of the other,
and the other retains the residual right to protest or modify the request so
that his own autonomy is not severely threatened. Includes acts in which
a recognized leader requests other(s) to do things as a part of the routine
mechanics of group management, or as administrative short-cuts to leader-
determined goals or group-determined goals. The leader's requests may
be unsolicited by the other and yet anticipate conformance on the part of
the other, on the assumption that the leader is acting as a legitimate agent
and instrument of the group. Routine signals for control of some detail of
procedure in the opening or closing of some group activity are included
such as calling the meeting to order or pronouncing that it is adjourned.
The assignment of tasks, the appointment of persons to committees, where
the chairman or leader has been given the authority to do so, the giving or
imputing of a role to another; that is, a request by the leader to another
individual to play a certain role in a group discussion, such as acting as a
recorder or observer, selecting the other for some activity on the basis of
the other's interest or consent, are included. Includes delegation of
authority or initiative. Where leadership is not implied, small emotion-
ally neutral requests of the actor to the other are included, such as,

"Would you hand me the ash tray, please?" (Emotionally toned requests for help, however, are classified in Category 11.)

5. Gives opinion, evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish:

a. The process of action itself in its inferential and optative aspects: Includes all indications of thought-in-process leading to an understanding of dawning insight, such as introspection, reasoning, reckoning, calculation, thinking, musing, cogitating, or concentrating. The actual statement of the hypothesis or expression of understanding or insight is included. Further logical elaboration, exploration, or testing of the hypothesis or diagnosis is included, whether by example, analogy, analysis of cause and effect relations, symbolic or categorical labeling, or by any sort of logical, intuitive or conjectural process. The inferential and evaluative element distinguishes acts in the present category from acts in Category 6. Includes acts of expressing or enunciating feelings or sentiments in the optative mood. Includes any expression of desire, want, liking, wishing, or hoping, any expression of sentiment or moral obligation, any affirmation of major values, any statement of policy, intention or guiding principles, or law, referring to a broad and indefinite future time perspective, as yet unimplemented as to ways and means. Examples: "I wish we could fix it so that . . ." "I think we ought to be fair about this." "I hope we can do something about that." "That seems to be the right thing to do." Any expression on the part of the actor of a need to achieve, any expression of ambition or aspiration, of determination or courage, is included. Manifestations of attitudes which would be called earnest, grave, reverent, serious or prayerful are included insofar as they involve a kind of expression of a major value or intention. Certain parts of prayer or performance of ceremonial or ritual acts are included, insofar as they are expressions and intensifications of intention, value or desire.

b. The self and own motivation as object of inference and evaluation: Includes activity in which the actor attempts, by inference or reasoning, in a primarily objective way, to understand, diagnose, or interpret his own motivation or the "why" of his own behavior. In a practical problem situation, any assessment or evaluation of the effectiveness or efficiency of one's past action is included, as when the actor reflectively examines a plan he has just tried out, or when he examines his own rehearsal or role-playing of future action. In a training, therapeutic, or counseling situation, any statement or indication that the trainee, patient, or client sees patterns and relationships in his own motivation, conduct or verbal production is included so long as it indicates to the observer an attempt at a logical and reasoned explanation rather than a self-defensive rationalization of conduct. Examples: "I must have been so mad at him that I didn't see he was trying to help me." "Probably I don't realize how nervous I am in situations like that." "I can see now that I totally misjudged the situation." (Statements which are considered to be largely self-defensive rationalizations are classified under Category 12. Statements considered to be largely negatively toned evaluations of self or conduct are classified under

Category 11. Statements which involve only simple recall or reporting about one's experience, without inference, are classified in Category 6.)

c. The other, his motivation, or the group as a whole as the object of inference and evaluation: Includes activity in which the actor attempts, by inference or reasoning, in a primarily objective way, to understand, diagnose, or interpret the other, his motivation or activity, the group, its structure, dynamics or past action. In counseling situations, includes all responses in which the counselor makes inferences or diagnoses, or points out patterns and relationships in the material presented by the client, of which the client has not yet expressed awareness, interpretations where causation is implied or indicated. Example: "You do this because all authority figures remind you of your father." An example from group discussion in an evaluation period: "Maybe we got off the track because some of us were more anxious to show what we knew than we were to solve the problem at hand." Activity in the present category is distinguished from activity in Category 6 in that it involves inference or interpretation rather than a simple report, reflection, or rephrasing. In group activity this kind of interaction is likely to occur in cases of self-evaluation and feedback, where the aim is to arrive at new insights about the motives, feelings, or problems, of the other or group members generally, the relations of members to each other, or features of group procedure. (Statements considered to be motivated largely by a desire to expose the other, or deflate his status, or which have this effect, are placed in Category 12. Statements which involve only simple report or recall about the other or group, without inference or diagnosis, are placed in Category 6.)

d. The outer situation as the object of inference and evaluation: Includes all statements about the nature of the outer situation facing the group as a whole, which are essentially inferential, hypothetical, a matter of opinion or plausible interpretation--not immediately observable. Examples: "It seemed to me that the patient we have just seen is more introverted than the last time we saw him." "According to my calculations it must be about three miles." "Well, let's see. Two times the square root of this second term is . . ." "It's the same as . . ." (This subvariety of Category 5 is the most frequent type of interaction for many groups, if not most.)

6. <u>Gives orientation, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms</u>:

a. <u>The process of activity or communication itself as the object of cogni-</u><u>tion</u>: Includes all acts which are intended to secure or focus the attention of the other or to insure his readiness for a series of communications to follow, such as calling his name, clearing the throat, engaging the eyes of the other, holding up the hand, mentioning a problem to be discussed, calling attention to what one is going to say, or pointing out the relevance of what one is saying or doing, any reference back to an agenda, the giving of any routine signal that one is beginning a new phase of activity or a new focus of effort, or signifying the end of a phase. Examples: "Ah. . . ." "Say John . . ." "There are two points I'd like to make." "In the first place . . ." "Now with regard to our problem of . . ." "Going back for a moment . . ." "What I am about to say relates to . . ." "That seems to finish our agenda." Interaction in this category may occur when a new individual comes into a situation or interaction process with which the other(s) are familiar, as when a new person arrives in the middle of a group discussion. Examples: "We were just discussing . . ." "I might bring you up to date on what we've been doing." Efforts to prevent or repair breaks in the flow of communication include repeating, clarifying confusion about something said, explaining, enlarging, summarizing, restating, not with the purpose of convincing or carrying the argument further, but simply with the purpose of making communication and orientation to process more adequate. Includes any reflective looking back on past activity of the group, such as the reading of a report or minutes, or any preparatory looking forward, as in the reviewing of items on an agenda which have already been decided.

b. <u>The self and own motivation as the object of cognition</u>: Includes activity in which the actor simply reports without inference or tells about some past thought, feeling, action, or experience of his own, either spontaneously or in response to questions as in Category 7. Includes any account of one's own private experience, where the actor tells what he felt, what was done, how it was done, the position he took on some issue, what happened, or where he gives information of a more public nature about himself, or how others regard the self. Examples: "I felt pretty downhearted about that time." "They all thought I was crazy." "This secretly pleased me." "I was actually on their side." "I am twenty-one years old." "I have lived here all my life." "I'll never forget the time I . . ." In counseling or therapeutic interviews a great deal of activity is in this category as the actor reports about the feelings he has, dreams he had, as he states facts about his past history, and as he reports about symptoms or difficulties which he faces. Only statements about the self which are essentially noninferential, however, and comparatively neutral in emotional tone are included here. (Whenever emotion or affect is apparent in the report as a present psychological state, the act is classified in an appropriate

category above or below, even though the emotion or affect is not connected with or directed toward the other to whom the actor is talking. In this case, the interaction is scored by placing the number of the actor, as usual, followed by an "x" rather than by the number of the other spoken to. Example: If, in a therapeutic interview, the client expresses aggression against the father, mother, or other person not present, the act would be classified under Category 12 below, and would be marked as directed to "x" rather than to the therapist.)

c. The other, his motivation, or the group as a whole as the object of cognition: Includes showing an understanding of the other or something he said by restating, reporting the essential content of what he has said, reflecting the content or feeling back to him, rephrasing, accepting and clarifying the feeling involved, without, however, resorting to inference or interpretation beyond that given by the subject himself. It includes putting the ideas, feelings, or affective tone in somewhat clearer or more recognizable form, with the intent of aiding the other in the formulation or reformulation of his problem, but the inference, if present, must be minimal. This type of activity is the nondirective technique par excellence, and probably appears more frequently in this type of counseling than in most other types of interaction. Example: (The client has been talking about his mother and says,) "Oh, she means well enough, I guess, but she just keeps bringing it up and bringing it up. Sometimes I wish she'd just forget the whole thing." Counselor: "Her intentions are good, but when she keeps harping on it, you get irritated." (The client has not said he was irritated, but irritation shows in his voice and manner.) In problem-solving groups interaction of essentially the same kind may appear, either spontaneously or in the process of group self-evaluation or in the process of a more formal feedback, where certain observations about the characteristics of the group taken by observer(s) are reported to the group, without interpretation, in order to make it possible for them to make an analysis of their own organizations and procedure. Example: "Three of the members indicate dissatisfaction with the meetings."

d. The outer situation as the object of cognition: Includes statements of fact about the nature of the outer situation facing the group which are essentially objective, straightforward, noninferential, nonemotionally toned, descriptive observations or empirical generalizations which are recognized as generally established or easily confirmed by observation. Includes factual information given gratuitously, as in a lecture or in tutoring, in the process of conveying knowledge where there is the implication that the other wants to know or needs to know something the actor can tell him. The implication is that the information given will be accepted, if understood. Examples: "We have just two days left." "The phone is out of operation." "It would take three days to reach him by mail."

7. <u>Asks for orientation, information, repetition, and confirmation:</u>

a. <u>The process of action as the object of cognitive effort:</u> Includes acts which indicate or express a lack of knowledge sufficient to support action: confusion or uncertainty about the position of the group with regard to its goals, the course of the discussion to the present point, about what has been said or is going on, about the meaning of a word or phrase, even though the actor has been present and has been paying attention. Includes the appearance of any attitude the observer would describe as puzzled, bewildered, baffled, stumped, fuddled, or obfuscated. Verbal examples: "What?" "What was that?" "I didn't quite understand you." "Would you repeat that?" "I don't quite get what you mean." More deliberate attempts to get the group to assess and clarify its position in the problem-solving process are also included, whether or not the actor is actually confused or disoriented himself. Examples: "Where are we?" "Where do we stand?"

b. <u>Self, other, or group, or outer situation as the object of cognitive effort:</u> Includes direct or outright questions which require the giving of a factual rather than an inferential answer; i.e., an answer which can be judged as true or false on the basis of simple observation, or which is generally accepted as a matter of convention. Also includes less focalized, or more indefinite, expressions of a lack of knowledge or cognitive clarity sufficient to support action; i.e., instances in which the requesting or asking is only implicit. Examples: "I don't know about this." "(I have looked,) but I can't make it out." "It isn't clear to me." "It may be true, or it may not be." The questions or requests, whether explicit or only implicit, can be about the outer situation facing the group, about the group itself, its structure or organization, about another person, or about the self (rare). Examples: "What day of the month is it?" "I'm not sure of the exact date." "Who is in charge of the arrangements for the next meeting?" "I have forgotten whom we appointed." "How long have you lived here?" "Let's see, how old was I at that time?" (to self). (This category does not include interrogative statements which are designed to redefine, clarify, or redescribe a feeling, such as: "You mean you don't really like him?" A remark of this kind would be classified under Category 5 or 6, according to the degree of inference or interpretation involved.)

8. Asks for opinion, evaluation, analysis, expression of feeling:

a. The process of action itself as the object of inferential or evaluative effort: Includes open-ended, nondirective leads and questions aimed at the exploration or intensification-through-expression of the other's feelings, values, intentions, and inclinations. Includes any kind of question which attempts to encourage a statement or reaction on the part of the other without limiting the nature of the response except in a very general way, with the implication that the other has freedom to express interest or disinterest, where he is not put under pressure to agree or disagree, or to come out with any predetermined answers, type of answer or attitude. Good examples may be found in nondirective counseling: "How do you feel today?" "Tell me more about it." "Just feel perfectly free to talk about anything you like." This kind of behavior occurs in group interaction where there is a desire and attempt on the part of the leader or group member to sound the others' feelings on a problem before discussion has begun or at any point in the process where evaluation may come into play. Examples: "I wonder how you feel about that?" "What do you think (i. e., feel)?" "Could we have an expression of feeling on this point?" "What is the sense of the meeting?" "What should our policy be?" "What do you think we ought to aim at?"

b. Self, other, group or outer situation as the object of inferential or evaluative effort: Includes questions, statements, or responses which seek an inferential interpretation, hypothesis, diagnosis, or further analysis of some idea from the other, his definition of the situation or opinion on some topic in a nonthreatening or objective manner. Also includes less focalized, or more indefinite expressions of an inability to make satisfactory inferences or value resolutions sufficient to support or lead on into overt action, i. e., emotional conflict, ambivalence. In these cases the requesting or asking is only implicit, perhaps, but is scored in the present category unless the emotional tone is marked enough to justify its inclusion under Category 11 (shows tension, anxiety, etc.). The inferences or evaluation requested, either explicitly or implicitly, may refer to the other situation facing the group itself, its structure or organization, to the other person, or to the self. The actor may wish to get the other's interpretation or opinion as an aid where there is no known answer and only conjecture is possible, or it may be to help the other to see implications of something he has said, to see action possibilities toward a solution of his problem, to facilitate his choosing a course of action, or to explore his motivation. Examples: "How long do you suppose it will be?" "I can't figure out how long it would take." "I wonder what changes that would involve?" "I wonder if there are any other possibilities?" "I don't know whether it would require changes or not." "I wonder if we are proceeding in the most effective way?" "Why do you think you feel that way?" "I don't know how I really feel." (So-called "significant pauses" may be scored in this category.)

9. <u>Asks for suggestion, direction, possible ways of action:</u>

a. <u>The process of action itself, the self, other or outer situation as the object of active modification:</u> Includes all questions or requests, explicit or implicit, for suggestions as to how action shall proceed through the utilization of concrete ways and means to goals in the immediate future time perspective. The request of a chairman for a motion from the floor is a pure example of this category of activity in explicit form, but more indefinite requests for suggestions as to what should be done in terms of finding ways, means, and solutions, requests for suggestions as to where to start, what to do next, what to decide, which are meant to begin a crystallization of a concrete plan of action are also included. Examples: "Is there a motion on this point?" "I wonder what we can do about this?" "I don't know what to do." "What do you suggest?" This kind of activity might appear in counseling where the counselor asks, "What shall we talk about today?" (Appeals for suggestions which have an emotional undertone of dependence, or of a need for help, an inability to take responsibility for direction rather than a sharing of the right to determine direction, should be classified in Category 11. Whether dependency is indicated or not, if the emotional tone becomes marked, the activity should be classified under Category 11. Example: "Gosh! What do I do now?" or Category 12. Example: "Well, what do <u>you</u> suggest then?")

10. <u>Disagrees, shows passive rejection, formality, withholds resources:</u>

a. <u>In response to Categories 1, 2 and 3</u>: Includes any indication of an attitude which the observer considers over-cool, frigid, inexpansive, unsmiling. Any situation in which an emotional response would be expected, where the actor refuses to give applause, or is unappreciative, unacknowledging, ungrateful, unallured, "hard to please," "hard to get," is included. Includes passive forms of rejection, such as remaining immobile, rigid, restrained, silent, close-mouth, uncommunicative, inexpressive, impassive, imperturbable, reticent, responseless, in the face of overtures of the other. Includes any passive withholding of love or friendship, any indication that the actor is psychically insulated, detached, isolated, indifferent, disinterested, impersonal, aloof, formal, distant, unsocial, reserved, secluded, unapproachable, exclusive or forbidding. Refraining from intimacies and confidences where the other appears to be seeking this kind of response is included. All undetermined member-to-member contacts, that is, asides, whispering, winks, etc., while the main discussion is going on between others are classified in this category as rejections by both participants of the rest of the group. Working at something other than the problem with which the group is concerned, when there is an expectation that all will be attending or actively participating is included. Speaking or paying attention to outsiders, such as observers, when the group as a whole is working on another problem is included. (More positive and aggressively toned acts of rejection, such as actually excluding the other, abandoning him, deserting him, dropping, rebuffing, repulsing, jilting, are marked in Category 12.)

b. <u>In response to Category 4</u>: Includes demurral with regard to suggestions made, any act in which the actor appears to be skeptical, dubious, cautious about accepting the proposal, hesitant, critical, suspicious, or distrustful. (More positive and aggressively toned acts of demurral are scored in Category 12.)

c. <u>In response to Categories 5 and 6</u>: Includes the milder degrees of disagreement, disbelief, astonishment, amazement, or incredulity regarding reports and observations, inferences or diagnoses or interpretations made by the other. More marked forms of strictly ideational disagreement are also included, as when the actor amends or corrects another's description of the situation, his interpretation or diagnosis, contradicts something the other has said. (Includes disapproval of an expression of value or feeling <u>only</u> if very mild and confined to the actual expression or suggestion, and it is made plain by some means that the disapproval does <u>not</u> extend to the other as a "person." Very usually, when moral judgments of disapproval are applied to expressions of feeling or suggestions, they reflect so strongly on the person making them that they should be scored under Category 12.)

d. In response to Categories 7, 8, 9, 11, 12: Includes failing to pay atten-
tion when the other is speaking, failing to give a requested repetition, dis-
regarding the other, ignoring a request of any kind or a complaint, by
direct evasion, postponement of answer without expressed reason or con-
sideration for the other, equivocation, delay, noncommittal, hedging.
More generally, includes any refusal to act which frustrates the other,
thwarts, balks, blocks, obstructs, or puts barriers in the way, any behav-
ior which restrains, hinders, limits the ongoing activity of the other, con-
fines, constrains, or stands in his way, or which renders his efforts vain,
upsets his plans, forestalls, contravenes, foils, or checkmates him. In-
cludes any act of withholding resources, the manifestation of any attitude
which the observer interprets as possessive, retentive, retractive, or
secretive. Any act in which the other is denied something requested, in
which the actor disappoints the other, refuses to let the other participate
in some satisfaction or have access to some resource may be included
here, if the aggressive tone is comparatively low. (As the active, out-
going aggressive element increases, the activity should be scored in Cate-
gory 12.)

e. In response to previous acts in Category 10: If the actor has made a
suggestion, and someone else in the meantime has disagreed with him,
when the actor returns to defend or restate his original definition of the
situation or proposal, his return is marked in this category as disagree-
ment. (In general, only the initial reaction of disagreement is marked in
the present category, when the disagreement is essentially ideational. The
arguments which follow, in the form of statements about the situation,
analyses of the facts, alternative suggestions, rhetorical questions, etc.,
are scored in their respective categories. Example: "I don't think so.
It seems to me that there were more than that. In fact, I remember see-
ing at least five." In the foregoing statement, only "I don't think so"
would be scored in the present category. The argument which follows in
support is broken up and scored in the categories above as usual.)

11. <u>Shows tension: asks for help, withdraws out of field:</u>

a. <u>Diffuse tension:</u> Includes all sorts of nonfocal manifestations of impatience, indications that the subject feels strained, on edge, restless, restive, keyed-up, agitated. The appearance of various "nervous habits"--doodling, self-grooming, fiddling, biting the nails, playing with some object--are included. Where the behavior is constant, a new score is entered once each minute. In machine scoring, a signal light is provided which flashes once each minute, at which time the observer scans the group rapidly and enters any indicated scores in this category.

b. <u>Diffuse anxiety:</u> Includes any manifestations or indication to the observer that the actor is startled, disconcerted, alarmed, dismayed, perturbed, concerned, qualmish, or has misgivings about something he has done or intends to do. Any show of anxious emotionality, such as hesitation, speechlessness, any indication of flurry, fluster, trembling, blenching, blushing, flushing, stammering, verbal disjunctivity, sweating, "blocking up," gulping, swallowing, or wetting the lips persistently is included. Includes any verbal or motor expression of fear, apprehension, worry, dread, fright, terror, or panic. Includes the manifestation of any attitude which the observer would interpret as overcautious, overwary, where the actor is overhesitant about undertaking some action, hangs back, shuns, evades, or shrinks from a perilous situation, or refrains from action because of fear of failure. Any behavior which the observer interprets as overprudent, careful, vigilant, tense, abashed, timid, shy, self-distrustful, self-effacing, self-conscious, shrinking, or inavoidant is included. Wherever the actor seems to be overanxious, inhibited, fearful of blame, sensitive about, or concerned about, the good opinion of others, is overcareful to do nothing that will annoy, antagonize, or alienate the affections of others, these indications are scored in this category. Includes the manifestation of any attitude which the observer would interpret as overscrupulous, unobjectionable, conscientious, conventional, dutiful, apparently because of fear of provoking opposition or hostility.

c. <u>Shame and guilt:</u> Includes responses to accusations in which the actor acknowledges, confesses, admits responsibility for some act of his which has been inconvenient, unjust, or unfair to another, or any act in which he admits his own ignorance or incapacity. Laughing alone, giggling nervously or apologetically is marked here. Appearing to be embarrassed, fussed, sheepish, chagrined, chapfallen, crestfallen, chastened, at a loss, mortified are included in this category. Moaning or cringing, covering the face with the hands, any act which indicates a consciousness of guilt, or any indication that the subject is furtive, ashamed, morose, depressed, or remorseful is included. Following this, any acts of atonement, in which the actor does something to balance a wrong, to expiate guilt, or humiliates himself, any action which shows that he is apologetic, contrite,

penitent, is included. Passing on to more extreme forms, blaming, be-
littling, and mutilating the self are included. Any act which could be
described as self-dissatisfied, -critical, -depreciating, -accusing,
-exposing, -convicting, -condemning, -disparaging, -dispraising,
-reproving, -reproachful, -upbraiding, -scornful, -degrading, -humiliat-
ing, -contemptuous, or self-destroying is included.

d. Frustration: Includes any indication on the part of the actor that his
effort has failed, that some problems confronting him in his earlier efforts
still remain, expressions of feeling frustrated, thwarted, or deprived are
included in this category, unless they are expressed in some more specifi-
cally socially oriented way as formulated in other categories. (For ex-
ample, frustration tension may be expressed in a more socially oriented
way by showing antagonism against the other, Category 12.) Wherever
the observer interprets that the actor is dissatisfied, discontented, dis-
appointed, displeased, and these feelings are expressed only in a diffuse
way, with no special social object, the indications are scored here. In-
cludes expressions of unhappiness, any indication that the actor is dis-
couraged, disheartened, disconsolate, downcast, downhearted, resigned,
desolate, despairing, miserable. Includes any appearance of brooding,
any indication of distress, disturbance, discomfort, fatigue, pain or in-
jury.

e. Asking for help, permission: Requests for permission or help which
carry a noticeable undertone of emotionality are included. (More neutral
requests may be scored above in a variety of categories, i.e., 4, 7, 8, 9,
according to their form.) Any act which the observer interprets as an
attempt to place the responsibility for the solution of one's own problems
on the other or on the group is included, such as asking for aid, advice,
support, asking for or appealing to the other's good nature, mercy, fore-
bearance. Includes acts in which the actor flatters, cajoles, attempts to
appease the other, where he insincerely abases himself, cowers, curries
favor, fawns, footlicks, bootlicks, or is servile with the purpose of
obtaining ulterior ends, where he attempts to shame the other into some
kind of desired behavior by acting as if injured, hurt, martyred, or put
upon, which he pretends to display. Includes any act in which the actor
petitions, begs or beseeches the other for some favor. The telling of mis-
fortunes, hardships, accidents, failures, with the intention of arousing
sympathy is included. Bewailing, whining, weeping, adopting a pathetic
or tragic attitude, holding out the arms, extending the hands for help,
exhibiting one's wounds, attempting to move the other to pity are included.
Attempts to exaggerate an injury, illness, or symptom of any kind, com-
plaints of being miserable, depressed, sad, worried, tired are included.
The manifestation of any attitude which the observer interprets as forlorn,
forsaken, insecure, grieving, tragic, despairing, helpless, lonesome,
tearful, sniffling, self-pitying, plaintive, suppliant, succorant, or

dependent is included. Showing any kind of need to be supported, nursed, sustained, protected, loved, advised, guided, indulged, forgiven, consoled is included. Any manifestation of a craving for affection is included.

f. Withdrawal out of field: Includes any behavior which indicates to the observer that the actor is unattentive, bored, or psychologically withdrawn from the problem at hand; slouching, yawning, closing the eyes, daydreaming, looking away from the work, letting the eyes wander are included. Includes the manifestation of any attitude the observer would interpret as listless, languid, bemused, absorbed, abstracted, adream, unaware, oblivious to others. More definite and overt withdrawal, such as giving notice, leaving, resigning, deserting, striking, quitting, retreating from humiliation, retiring, going home, is included. More extreme forms of autistic, subjective, or socially irrelevant behavior or response which indicate a lack of contact with what is going on are included, such as talking to the self or mumbling. Any indication of excessive inaction, non-responsiveness, or reclusiveness may be classified in this category. Any indication to the observer that the actor is psychologically shut-in, indisposed, apathetic, resigned, despondent, numbed, stunned, stupefied, or inarticulate is included.

12. <u>Shows antagonism, deflates other's status, defends or asserts self:</u>

a. <u>Autocratic control</u>: Includes attempts to control, regulate, govern, direct, or supervise in a manner which the observer interprets as arbitrary or autocratic, in which freedom of choice or consent for the other person is either greatly limited or nonexistent, with the implication that the other has no right to protest or modify the demand but is expected to follow the directive immediately without argument. Includes the arbitrary assignment of a role, the location or relocation of the other, a defining or restricting of the other's powers by fiat, demands or commands such as "Come here!" "Stop that!" "Hurry up!" "Get out!" Any act in which the actor peremptorily beckons, points, pushes, pulls, or otherwise directly controls or attempts to control the activity of the other is included. More extreme acts of dismissal or expulsion, where the actor evicts, discharges, cashiers, banishes the other, are included. Includes any act in which the observer interprets the attitude of the actor to be overbearing, dogmatic, assertive, imperious, inconsiderate, or severe. Includes arbitrary attempts to lay down principles of conduct, standards, or laws, arbitrary attempts to judge or settle an argument, to give a decision, to force, compel, coerce, subdue, subject, tame, master, dominate. Includes acts in which the actor prohibits the other from doing something, represses the other, proscribes some activity, interdicts, taboos, gives warnings, threats.

b. <u>Autonomy</u>: Includes any response to an attempt at control in which the actor shows active autonomy, is noncompliant, unwilling, or disobliging, where he resists some effort or imagined effort of a superior other to take some satisfaction from him. Includes any act in which the actor rejects, refuses, or purposefully ignores directions, commands, demands, or authoritative requests. Includes any behavior in which the actor defies authority, is negativistic, stubborn, resistant, obstinate, refractory, contrary, sulky, or sullen. Includes shrugging the shoulders, avoiding or quitting activities prescribed by authority, resisting coercion and restriction, trying in any manner to shake off restraint or get free. Includes any behavior which works against or circumvents authority, in which the actor shows independence, nonsubmissiveness, nonconformity, is disobedient, insubordinate, rebellious, irresponsible, willful, obstreperous, unrestrained, disorderly. Includes aggressive acts against authority, such as carping, harping, griping, nagging, badgering, harassing, annoying, perturbing, disturbing, or pestering the other. Includes the manifestation of any attitude which the observer interprets as disrespectful, <u>discourteous</u>, impudent, bold, saucy, flippant, impervious, unashamed, or unrepentant when justly accused.

c. <u>Status deflating</u>: On the milder side includes conspicuous attempts to override the other in conversation, interrupting the other, interferring

with his speaking, gratuitously finishing his sentence for him when the other does not want help, insisting on finishing, warding off interruption. With regard to active attacks or deflation of the other's status, any implication of inferiority or incompetence on the part of the other is included, such as appraising the other contemptuously, belittling, depreciating, disparaging, ridiculing, minimizing the other, reducing his remarks to absurdity, making fun of him. Includes any acts in which the actor would be described as maliciously sarcastic, satirical, ironical, in which the actor lampoons, caricatures, burlesques the other or becomes unduly and insultingly familiar. Includes teasing, taunting, heckling, gloating, crowing, jeering, scoffing, mocking, sneering, bedevilling, goading, baiting, or provoking the other to say something indiscreet or damaging. Includes damning the other, finding fault with him, complaining, criticizing him; any act that would be interpreted as abusive, accusatory, acrimonious. Includes making charges against the other, imputing unworthy motives to him, blaming him, denouncing him, excoriating, berating, prosecuting, ill-treating, or browbeating him. Includes any act of gossip, any libel, slander, smirching of the other's character, branding him with undesirable characteristics, demeaning him, tattling against him, informing against him, exposing him, placing him at a disadvantage or oppugning him. Includes tricking, hoaxing, duping, fleecing, hazing, humiliating the other or rendering him conspicuous. With regard to disapproval, includes acts ranging from mild forms of disapproval, such as reprimanding the other, blaming him, scolding him, admonishing him or reminding him of his duty, on to more extreme forms, such as indications that the actor is shocked, indignant, appalled, scandalized at something the other has done, and shows horror or disgust. Includes any indication that the actor is indignant, offended, insulted, affronted. Includes indications of moral indignation, such as a grim appearance, appearing incensed, irate, outraged, infuriated. Includes any act of showing ascendance, any act that would be described as pompous, pontifical, ceremonious, self-opinionated, self-important, self-righteous, self-satisfied, self-complacent, or smug. Includes any act which would be regarded as haughty, proud, vain, arrogant, "uppish," snobbish, self-admiring, self-conceited, presumptuous, condescending, or disdainful.

d. _Status defending:_ Includes any act in which the actor suppresses, conceals, hides, fails to mention, or justifies something which is considered discreditable, such as ineptitude, ignorance, a defect, some misdeed, failure, or humiliation. Includes the manifestation of any attitude which the observer would regard as indicating that the actor is "on his guard," has a "chip on his shoulder," such as interpreting a harmless remark as a slur, bristling when criticized, protesting, asserting one's own claims. Includes any act of defending or protecting the self, one's sentiments, or theories against assault, criticism, or blame, in an ego-involved way.

Includes any act of self-vindication or exculpation, such as explaining, excusing, justifying, offering extenuations for or rationalization of inferiority, guilt or failure, giving alibis, any act of disavowal, dis-acknowledging guilt, any disclaiming, denial, or refusal to admit guilt, inferiority, or weakness.

e. <u>Status seeking</u>: Includes any act in which the actor is self-assertive from a position which has the implication of lower status, in which he tries to impress the other with his importance, tries to be seen or heard, in which he pushes himself forward, dramatizes himself, poses as a unique, mysterious, incalculable person. Includes any behavior which the observer regards as exhibitionistic, spectacular, or conspicuous. Includes attempts to excite, amaze, fascinate, entertain, shock, intrigue or amuse the other(s) as a means of raising one's own status. Includes any behavior in which the observer regards the subject as "acting," showing off, seeking applause or approbation, playing the clown, especially the making of jokes which fall flat or do not provoke a general laugh. Includes attempts to attract attention by mannerism, expressive gestures, emphatic or extravagant speech, posturing, posing for effect, displaying the self, seeking the limelight, bragging, boasting, strutting, blustering. Includes praising the self, glorifying, exalting, applauding, approving, or advertising the self. Includes any act in which the actor tries to outdo the other, shows rivalry.

f. <u>Diffuse aggression</u>: Includes any manifestation of an emotional reaction to another which the observer would interpret as cranky, uncongenial, touchy, tiffish, testy, surly, irritable, ill-tempered, irascible, contumacious. Includes the manifestation of any attitude the observer would interpret as aggressive, combative, belligerent, pugnacious, quarrelsome, or argumentative. Includes any behavior in which the actor appears to be provoked, in which he shows annoyance, irritation, heat, anger, rage, or has a temper tantrum. Includes any indication of intolerance, malevolence, such as glaring, frowning, cursing, fuming, hissing, jostling, pushing, having a fit of rage, screaming, kicking, scratching. Includes moving or speaking in a threatening manner, challenging, defying, attacking, assailing, assaulting, hitting, striking, beating, fighting the other. Includes the manifestation of any attitude which the observer would interpret as destructive, cruel, or ruthless, or any act the observer interprets as resentful, vengeful, vindictive, or retaliative. Includes any indication of envy, jealousy, covetousness, cupidity, avarice, acquisitiveness at the expense of the other, or attempts to take something away from the other.

DATE:_____   GROUP:_____   OBSERVER:_____

THERAPIST BEHAVIOR RATING FORM

1. Shows solidarity, raises other's status, gives help, reward					
2. Shows tension release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction					
3. Agrees, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies					
4. Gives suggestion, direction, implying autonomy for the other					
5. Gives opinion, evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish					
6. Gives orientation, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms					
7. Asks for orientation, information, repetition, confirmation					
8. Asks for opinion, evaluation, analysis, expression of feeling					
9. Asks for suggestion, direction, possible ways of action					

10. Disagrees, shows passive
    rejection, formality,
    withholds resources

11. Shows tension, asks for
    help, withdraws out of
    field

12. Shows antagonism, de-
    flates other's status,
    defends or asserts self

APPENDIX B

EXPRESSIVE TRAINING MANUAL[1]

---

[1]Written by Kirwin (1971) and reprinted with his consent.

Outline of Expressive Training Procedures (Form 1)

  I. Pretesting Session

     A. Presentation of pre-tests as routine psychological tests.

     B. Group administration with individual assistance as necessary.

  II. Therapists' training session

     A. Brief review of pertinent literature.

     B. Discussion of the rationale of expressive training.

     C. Roleplay and group discussion exercises.

  III. First Treatment Session

     A. Roleplay exercise for evaluation, using Anger Situation List (ASL) and Feeling Word List (FWL).

     B. Preparation for extra-group study of ASL and FWL.

  IV. Second Treatment Session

     A. Group discussion of each Subject's ($\underline{S}$'s) habitual means of communicating feeling.

     B. Statement of opportunity for $\underline{S}$ to learn new techniques for communicating feelings.

     C. Roleplay exercise using ASL.

     D. Group discussion of need for expressive training.

     E. Preparation for extra-group study of Varied Situation List (VSL) and FWL.

  V. Third Treatment Session

     A. Group discussion of each $\underline{S}$'s goals with respect to changes in expressive behavior.

     B. Group discussion of the group's methods for giving $\underline{S}$ feedback on the effects of his expression of feeling.

C. Group discussion of <u>S</u>'s reactions to the VSL.

D. Roleplay exercise using VSL.

E. Preparation for <u>S</u>'s 'slightly difficult' extra-group expression.

F. Small group discussion for the expression of feelings about controversial statements.

G. Group discussion of Feeling Word List.

H. Preparation for extra-group writing of <u>S</u>'s 'slightly difficult' problem situations.

VI. Fourth Treatment Session

A. Group discussion of new learning reported by <u>S</u>'s.

B. Review of <u>S</u>'s 'slightly difficult' extra-group expression.

C. Roleplay of <u>S</u>'s 'slightly difficult' problem situation.

D. Preparation for <u>S</u>'s 'moderately difficult' extra-group expression.

E. Preparation for extra-group writing of <u>S</u>'s 'moderately difficult' problem situations.

VII. Fifth Treatment Session

A. Review of <u>S</u>'s 'moderately difficult' extra-group expression.

B. Roleplay of <u>S</u>'s 'moderately difficult' problem situation.

C. Preparation for <u>S</u>'s 'fairly difficult' extra-group expression with <u>S</u> directing roleplay prior to taking roles.

D. Preparation for extra-group writing of <u>S</u>'s 'fairly difficult' problem situations.

VIII. Sixth Treatment Session

A. Group discussion of each <u>S</u>'s goals in the group and the general purpose of the group.

B. Review of <u>S</u>'s 'fairly difficult' extra-group expression.

C. Roleplay of S's 'fairly difficult' problem situation with S directing roleplay prior to taking roles.

D. Preparation for S's 'very difficult' extra-group expression.

E. Small group discussion for the expression of feelings about the problem situations of others.

F. Preparation for extra-group writing of S's 'very difficult' problem situations.

IX. Seventh Treatment Session

A. Group discussion of any questions raised by Ss or Ts.

B. Review of S's 'very difficult' extra-group expression.

C. Roleplay of S's 'very difficult' problem situation, with S directing roleplay prior to taking roles.

D. Roleplay exercise using ASL (Form 2).

Description of Expressive Training Procedures

I. Pretesting session

    A. Pretests are presented as routine psychological tests.

    B. Ss are tested as a group with individual assistance given as necessary.

II. Therapists' training session

    A. Brief review of pertinent literature.

    B. Discussion of the rationale of expressive training.

    C. Roleplay and group discussion exercises in which therapists (Ts) practice applying the techniques to be subsequently used by Ss.

III. First treatment session

    A. Roleplay exercise for evaluation (not for expressive training).

        1. The purpose of the exercise is to reveal each S's mode of expressing feeling and provide him with feedback on the impact of his expression on others.

        2. The group is divided into as many subgroups as possible with the restriction that not less than one S and one T be placed in each subgroup.

        3. The materials employed are the Feeling Word List (FWL), Anger Situation List (ASL), and Expressive Behavior Record (EBR).

        4. Each S plays the role of Expressor (one who is confronted with a feeling-provoking situation) at least once during the session.

        5. Procedures.

            a. Discussion and trial roleplay phase.

                (1) S uses the FWL to help label two or three of his stronger feelings about a situation in the ASL.

III. First treatment session (cont.)

    A. Roleplay exercise for evaluation.

        5. Procedures.

           a. Discussion and trial roleplay phase.

                (2) S̲ identifies phrases in the ASL which arouse the reported feelings.

                (3) S̲ roleplays (with a member of his subgroup) the expression of the reported feelings until such time as S̲ is satisfied that he has clearly communicated the feelings and their specific causes.

           b. Test roleplay phase.

                (1) S̲ moves to a new subgroup which has not witnessed his performance in phase one.

                (2) Once again S̲ roleplays the expression of feelings about the ASL material used in phase one.

                (3) T̲ indicates to S̲ the extent to which the feelings and causes identified in phase one (as recorded in the EBR) were communicated.

    B. Preparation for extra-group study of ASL and FWL.

        1. The purpose of the assignment is to acquaint S̲ with the FWL and with the ASL situations which are most significant to him, and to give him practice in constructing feeling-cause statements.

        2. All group members are seated in a large circle with T̲s distributed evenly among S̲s to enable S̲s to ask questions of T̲s near them.

        3. Each S̲ reads Situation No. 1 of the ASL.

           a. S̲ draws a circle around two phrases which arouse strong feelings.

           b. S̲ uses the FWL to find two feeling words which indicate his strongest feelings about the phrases circled, and writes the two words in the space beneath Situation No. 1.

III. First treatment session (cont.)

B. Preparation for extra-group study of ASL and FWL.

4. S repeats the above exercise for one or two additional Situations, or until he is sure he understands how to complete the exercise for the remainder of the ASL.

5. S is asked to bring the completed written exercise for the ASL to the next group meeting.

IV. Second treatment session

A. Group discussion in which all Ts and Ss give examples of their habitual verbal and nonverbal means of communicating feelings.

B. Ss are told that the expressive training group will provide them with an opportunity to compare the effects of their usual expressive methods with the effects of some new techniques for expressing feeling.

1. Ss are told that no attempt will be made to negatively judge their habitual methods of expression.

2. Ss are asked to adopt the group's techniques for the duration of the group sessions and then decide where the new techniques will be useful to them.

C. Roleplay exercises for expressive training, using the ASL.

1. The purpose of the exercise is to bring about an increase in feeling-cause statements and a decrease in competing responses.

2. Procedures.

a. Procedures are similar to those used for the roleplay exercises of the previous session (Section III.B.) but with some additional instructions.

b. T introduces the instructions by giving them to Ts who model the use of the instructions in two Situations selected from the ASL by Ss.

IV. Second treatment session (cont.)
   C. Roleplay exercises for expressive training, using the ASL.
      2. Procedures.

         c. Instructions for taking Expressor and Opposer roles.

           (1) Instructions for the Expressor (one who responds to a feeling-provoking situation).

              (a) Use 'feeling-cause' statements.

                 i. The FWL provides illustrations of feeling words.

                 ii. As used here the word 'cause' refers to an observable event, e.g. the actions or verbalizations of self or others, stimulus changes in the environment, etc. A handy rule of thumb is: If it can be photographed or sound recorded, it probably meets the criterion for 'causes.'

              (b) Do not make threats, demands, criticisms, logical arguments, philosophic observations or other statements which might distract attention from your feeling-cause message.

           (2) Instructions for the Opposer (one who is part of a feeling-provoking situation).

              (a) Use all appropriate means to elicit anger in the Expressor, e.g., sarcasm, impudence, 'needling,' etc.

              (b) Appear interested in what the Expressor says by not interrupting him while he is speaking, by looking directly at him, etc.

              (c) Do not comply with the requests of the Expressor.

              (d) (In trial roleplays only) Ask Expressor for specific information such as: 'What caused that feeling?' or 'Exactly how do you feel about what I said?'

IV. Second treatment session (cont.)

    C. Roleplay exercises for expressive training, using the ASL.

       2. Procedures.

         c. Instructions for taking Expressor and Opposer roles.

           (2) Instructions for the Opposer.

               (e) Be explicit about expressing the 'causes' in the ASL.

         d. The particular Situation to be roleplayed is selected by the S who is assigned the Expressor role.

    D. Large group discussion of two questions pertaining to the need for expressive training.

       1. What happens when we do not express our feelings?

       2. In what situations would we find feeling-cause statements useful?

    E. Preparation for extra-group study of the Varied Situation List (VSL) and FWL. Procedures are the same as for Section III.B., with the following exceptions:

       1. The Varied Situation List (VSL) replaces the Anger Situation List (ASL).

       2. Ss are told that the new list is designed to help with the expression of feelings other than anger.

V. Third treatment session

    A. Group discussion of each S's goals with respect to changes in expressive behavior.

    B. Group discussion of the group's methods for giving S feedback on the effects of his expression of feeling.

    C. Group discussion of S's reactions to those Situations on the VSL which were especially significant to them.

    D. Roleplay exercises for expressive training, using the VSL.

       1. The purpose of the exercise is to provide S with an opportunity to construct feeling-cause statements for emotions other than anger.

V. Third treatment session (cont.)

   D.   Roleplay exercises for expressive training, using the VSL.

      2. T introduces the new instructions by giving them to Ts who
         model the use of the instructions in two Situations selected
         from the VSL by Ss.

      3. Procedures.

         a. The procedures will be similar to those of the roleplay
            exercise using the ASL, with a few exceptions.

         b. Instructions for the Opposer.

            (1) Try to avoid eliciting anger in the Expressor. Try
                 instead to arouse such feelings as joy, sadness, re-
                 spect, fear, etc.

            (2) Use any means you can think of to arouse feelings in
                 the Expressor, e.g., posture, facial expression, tone
                 of voice, etc.

            (3) (In trial roleplays only) Ask Expressor for specific
                 information such as: 'What caused that feeling?' or
                 'Exactly how do you feel?'

            (4) Be explicit about expressing the 'causes' in the VSL.

   E.   Preparation for S's 'slightly difficult' extra-group expression.

      1. The purpose of the exercise is to permit S to practice expres-
         sing threatening material within the group setting before
         expressing the same material outside the group.

      2. The group is divided into as many subgroups as possible with
         the restriction that not less than one S and one T be placed in
         each subgroup.

      3. The Feeling Word List (FWL) is used by S to help identify
         and label feeling responses to the problem situation.

      4. Roleplay procedures.

V. Third treatment session (cont.)
   E. Preparation for S's 'slightly difficult' extra-group expression.
      4. Roleplay procedures.

         a. Instructions for taking Expressor and Opposer roles.

            (1) Instructions for the Expressor.

                Use feeling-cause statements while avoiding threats,
                demands, criticisms, and other distracting statements
                (see Section IV.C.).

            (2) Instructions for the Opposer.

                Attempt to use the manner and feeling-provoking
                statements of the Opposer as required by the situation.

         b. Sequence of roleplay activities.

            (1) Discussion phase.

                (a) S describes a situation that will permit him to
                    express feelings sometime before the next group
                    meeting.

                    i.   The expressive statement should be only
                         slightly difficult for S to make.

                    ii. Positive or negative feelings may be ex-
                         pressed.

                (b) Subgroup members ask whatever questions are
                    necessary to insure that the feelings and causes
                    are clearly understood by all.

                (c) S gives explicit instructions to the Opposing
                    player concerning the manner of and the feeling-
                    provoking statements made by the Opposer.

            (2) Trial roleplay phase with S taking the expressor role.

V. Third treatment session (cont.)

   E. Preparation for S's 'slightly difficult' extra-group expression.

      4. Roleplay procedures.

         b. Sequence of roleplay activities.

            (2) Trial roleplay phase with S taking the expressor role.

               (a) S assumes the Expressor role and maintains the roleplay until such time as he is satisfied that he has clearly communicated the specified feelings and causes.

               (b) The Opposer indicates what feelings, causes, and other messages were received.

               (c) T indicates the extent to which the feelings and causes identified in the discussion phase were communicated.

               (d) If considered necessary by T, S repeats the roleplay.

   F. Expression of feeling in small group discussions of controversial statements.

      1. The purpose of the exercise is to permit the expression of feeling in a semi-structured group discussion of relatively non-threatening topics.

      2. The group is divided into subgroups of about six persons each with Ts distributed evenly among subgroups.

      3. Procedures.

         a. One S in each subgroup is asked to make a controversial statement which is likely to arouse strong feelings in the remaining Ss.

         b. Each of the remaining Ss in turn is asked to use the FWL to label two or three of his stronger feelings about the statement in question.

         c. Ss are asked to avoid making any statements which are not statements of feeling, e.g. avoid persuasion, rational argument, criticism, etc.

V. Third treatment session (cont.)

    F. Expression of feeling in small group discussions of controversial statements.

        3. Procedures.

            d. All statements not pertaining directly to the report of feelings are pointed out by T̲s as they occur.

        4. A single large group is formed to discuss S̲s' and T̲s' reactions to the small group discussion exercise.

    G. T̲ leads a large group discussion of the FWL words which are thought by T̲s or S̲s to require definitions and illustrations to use.

    H. Preparation for extra-group writing of S̲'s 'slightly difficult' problem situations.

        1. The purpose of the assignment is to have each S̲, on his own time outside the group, record slightly threatening problem situations to be roleplayed during the next group meeting.

        2. All group members are seated in a large circle, with T̲s distributed evenly among S̲s to enable S̲s to ask questions of T̲s near them.

        3. S̲s are asked to fill out, as briefly as possible, Expressive Behavior Record (EBR) forms for two problem situations in which he would have slight difficulty in expressing his feelings.

            a. The situations should be some which S̲ expects to experience in the near future, or some which he has experienced in the past and continues to find meaningful.

            b. Feelings and causes pertaining to the situation should be clearly listed in the EBR.

            c. The feelings expressed may be positive, negative, or some combination thereof.

            d. S̲ uses the FWL to help identify all of his stronger feelings about the situation.

VI. <u>Fourth treatment session</u>

A. Group discussion in which Ss report on their impressions of new learning in the Expressive Training Group.

B. Review of S's 'slightly difficult' extra-group expression.

1. The purpose of the review is to give Ts and Ss feedback on the effectiveness of preparation for the completed extra-group expression.

2. Subgroups are formed with each T meeting with those Ss he observed performing the 'slightly difficult' trial roleplay of the extra-group expression.

3. S is asked to describe his extra-group expression or roleplay the expression in exactly the manner employed outside the group.

a. Prior to the roleplay, S instructs the Opposer on how to roleplay the 'causes' for the feelings to be expressed.

b. T points out similarities and differences, if any, between the present and the previously rehearsed roleplays as recorded in the EBR of the previous meeting.

C. Roleplay of S's 'slightly difficult' problem situation.

1. The purpose of the exercise is to provide S with practice in communicating feeling-cause statements in threatening situations.

2. T introduces the new instructions by giving them to Ts who model the use of the instructions in two situations produced by Ts.

3. Roleplay procedures.

a. Instructions for taking Expressor and Opposer roles.

(1) Instructions for the Expressor.

Use feeling-cause statements while avoiding threats, demands, criticisms, and other distracting statements (see Section IV. C.).

VI. Fourth treatment session (cont.)

    C. Roleplay of S's 'slightly difficult' problem situation.

       3. Roleplay procedures.

         a. Instructions for taking Expressor and Opposer roles.

           (2) Instructions for the Opposer.

              Attempt to use the manner and feeling-provoking statements of the Opposer as required by the situation.

         b. Sequence of roleplay activities.

           (1) Discussion phase.

              (a) S describes his prepared statements about his situation (see Section V.H.) to his subgroup, and T records the statements on an EBR form.

              (b) Subgroup members ask whatever questions are necessary to insure that the feeling and causes are clearly understood by all.

              (c) S gives explicit instructions to the Opposing player concerning the manner and the feeling-provoking statements to be made by the Opposer.

           (2) Trial roleplay phase with S taking the Expressor role.

              (a) S assumes the Expressor role and maintains the roleplay until such time as he is satisfied that he has clearly communicated the feelings and their specific causes.

              (b) The Opposer indicates what feelings, causes, and other messages were received.

              (c) T indicates any similarities or differences between the feeling-cause statements S planned to make during the discussion phase and the feeling-cause statements actually made during the trial roleplay.

              (d) If considered necessary, T asks S to repeat the trial roleplay.

VI. Fourth treatment session (cont.)
    C. Roleplay of S's 'slightly difficult' problem situation.
        3. Roleplay procedures.
            b. Sequence of roleplay activities.

                (3) Test roleplay phase.

                    (a) S moves to a new subgroup which has not wit-
                        nessed his preparator's discussion and trial role-
                        play.

                    (b) Once again S takes the Expressor role, continuing
                        the roleplay until such time as he is satisfied that
                        he has communicated the specified feeling-cause
                        statements.

                    (c) The Opposer and T once again give S the kinds of
                        feedback given following the trial roleplay.

    D. Preparation for 'moderately difficult' extra-group expression.

        1. The purpose and procedures are essentially similar to those
           for the 'slightly difficult' extra-group expression (Section
           V.E.).

        2. Ss should be instructed to prepare for an expression that is a
           bit more difficult to carry out than the 'slightly difficult' one
           but not so difficult as to cause S to avoid the situation or feel
           greatly upset by it.

    E. Preparation for extra-group writing of S's 'moderately difficult'
       problem situations.

        1. Procedures are essentially the same as those for the 'slightly
           difficult' situations (Section V.H.).

        2. Ss should be instructed to write statements that are a bit
           more difficult to express than the 'slightly difficult' ones, but
           not so difficult as to cause S to be greatly upset.

        3. The prepared situations are to be roleplayed during the next
           meeting of the group.

VII. <u>Fifth treatment session</u>

    A. Review of 'moderately difficult' extra-group expression.

    The purpose and procedures are essentially the same as those for the 'slightly difficult' extra-group expression (Section VI. B.).

    B. Roleplay of <u>S</u>'s 'moderately difficult' problem situation.

        1. The purpose and procedures are essentially the same as those for the 'slightly difficult' problem situation (Section VI. C.).

        2. The modeling of instructions by staff is omitted.

    C. Preparation for <u>S</u>'s 'fairly difficult' extra-group expression with <u>S</u> directing roleplay prior to taking role.

        1. The purpose of the exercise is to permit <u>S</u> to experience his situation from the viewpoint of an observer prior to participating as an Expressor.

        2. Procedures.

            a. Procedures are the same as those for the preparation for S's 'slightly difficult' extra-group expression (Section <u>V</u>. E.) with some modifications.

            b. A <u>S</u>'s directing phase follows the discussion phase and precedes the trial roleplay phase in the sequence of roleplay activities.

                (1) <u>S</u> directs the roleplaying of two members of his sub-group who adopt Expressor and Opposer roles.

                (2) If necessary, roleplaying of the situation is repeated until such time as <u>S</u> is satisfied that the specified feelings and causes have been adequately communicated.

                (3) <u>S</u> assumes full responsibility for the director's role, and is given total command of this phase of the exercise.

            c. Each <u>S</u>'s expressive statement should be somewhat more difficult to make than the 'moderately difficult' one, but not so difficult as to cause <u>S</u> to avoid making the expression or to be greatly upset.

VII. Fifth treatment session (cont.)

    D. Preparation for extra-group writing of S's 'fairly difficult' problem situations.

        1. Procedures are essentially the same as those for the 'slightly difficult' situations (Section V.H.).

        2. Expressive statements should be somewhat more difficult to make than the 'moderately difficult' ones, but no so difficult as to cause S to be greatly upset.

        3. The prepared situations are to be roleplayed during the next group meeting.

VIII. Sixth treatment session

    A. Group discussion of each S's current goals with respect to changes in expressive behavior.

    B. Review of S's 'fairly difficult' extra-group expression.

    The purpose and procedures are essentially the same as those for the 'slightly difficult' extra-group expression (Section VI.B.).

    C. Roleplay of S's 'fairly difficult' problem situation with S directing roleplay prior to taking roles.

        1. The purpose of the exercise is to permit S to experience his situation from the respective viewpoints of Observer, Opposer, and Expressor.

        2. Roleplay procedures.

            a. Instructions for taking Expressor and Opposer roles (see Section VI.C.3.a.).

            b. Sequence of roleplay activities.

                (1) Discussion phase.

                    (a) Procedures are given in Section VI.C.3.b. (1).

VIII. **Sixth** treatment session (cont.)

    C. Roleplay of S's 'fairly difficult' problem situation with S direct-
ing roleplay prior to taking roles.

        2. Roleplay procedures.

           b. Sequence of roleplay activities.

              (1) Discussion phase.

                  (b) Specifications for the problem situation to be
roleplayed are given in Section VII. D.

              (2) Directing phase.

                  (a) S directs the roleplaying of two members of his
subgroup who adopt the Expressor and Opposer
roles.

                  (b) S assumes full responsibility and command of
this phase of the exercise.

                  (c) If necessary, roleplaying of the situation is re-
peated until such time as S is satisfied that the
specified feelings and causes have been adequately
communicated.

              (3) Opposing role phase.

                  (a) S moves to a new subgroup.

                  (b) S describes situation to be roleplayed.

                  (c) S plays the Opposer's role in his problem situa-
tion.

                  (d) S gives the Expressor feedback on the adequacy
of the expression of feelings and causes.

              (4) Trial roleplay phase with S taking the Expressor role
(see Section VI. C. 3. b. (2)).

              (5) Test roleplay phase (see Section VI. C. 3. b. (3)).

VIII. Sixth treatment session (cont.)

    D. Preparation for S's 'very difficult' extra-group expression.

        1. The purpose and procedures are essentially the same as those for the 'slightly difficult' extra-group expression (Section V. E.).

        2. Ss should be instructed to prepare for the most difficult expression he is able to carry out without great discomfort.

    E. Small group discussion for the expression of feelings about the problem situations of others.

        1. The purpose of the exercise is to permit the expression of feeling in a semi-structured group discussion of topics which may be slightly threatening.

        2. The procedures are essentially the same as those for the small group discussion of controversial statements (Section V. F. 3.) with the exception that controversial statements are replaced by reports of personal problems by Ss.

    F. Preparation for extra-group writing of S's 'very difficult' problem situations.

        1. Procedures are essentially the same as those for the 'slightly difficult' situations (Section V. H.).

        2. Expressive statements should be the most difficult that S can carry out without great discomfort.

IX. Seventh treatment session

    A. Group discussion of any questions raised by Ss or Ts. No attempt is made by Ts to affect the choice of questions by Ss.

    B. Review of S's 'very difficult' extra-group expression. The purpose and procedures are essentially the same as those for the 'slightly difficult' extra-group expression (Section VI. B.).

IX. Seventh treatment session (cont.)

    C.   Roleplay of S's 'very difficult' problem situation, with S directing roleplay prior to taking roles. The purpose and procedures are essentially the same as those for the 'fairly difficult' problem situation (Section VIII.C.) with the exception that the expressive statements are the most difficult that S is able to carry out without great discomfort.

    D.   Roleplay exercise using Anger Situation List, Form 2.

        1. The purpose and procedures are essentially the same as those for the ASL, Form 1 (Section III.A.).

        2. The two situations to be roleplayed by each S are circled by E prior to distributing the lists to S.

APPENDIX C

TRAINING MATERIALS FOR EXPRESSIVE TRAINING[1]

---

[1]All of the materials contained in this appendix, unless otherwise noted, were written jointly with Dr. Paul Kirwin.

Word List for Description of Feelings:

Unpleasurable		Pleasurable	Other
afraid	uncomfortable	amused	apathetic
aggravated	uneasy	attracted	appreciative
alienated	unfriendly	beautiful	arrogant
angry	unsociable	calm	aroused
anxious	upset	cheerful	astonished
ashamed		comforted	cautious
bad mood		contented	concerned
bored		excited	courageous
bothered		friendly	cowardly
coolness toward		fulfilled	flabbergasted
discontented		happy	forgiving
dislike		high	grateful
displeased		hopeful	humble
distrusting		like	indifferent
disturbed		love toward	kindness toward
dull		pleased	mixed feelings
embarrassed		proud	pity
envious		relaxed	reckless
fear		relieved	solemn
flustered		satisfied	surprised
frustrated		sociable	sympathetic
hate toward		touched	thankful
helpless		trusting	wonder
hopeless		turned on	
humiliated		wanted	
hurt		warmth	
impatient		welcome	
irritated			
jealous			
lonely			
low/down			
nasty			
nervous			
regretful			
resentful			
revengeful			
sad			
suspicious			
troubled			
ugly			

SITUATIONS, ANG-1[*]

1. A friend was going to meet you downtown and go to a movie with you. You have been waiting an hour and the movie is already half over. He comes up and says that he had a few errands to run first. Tell him what you think of him.

2. You have just bought a new pair of slacks and after arriving home discovered that the seam was pulling out. You take them back to the store and the clerk insists that you must have somehow torn them. Answer him.

3. You are in a strange town and come upon two men fighting fiercely. You rush to tell the local sheriff about it. He looks angrily at you and tells you that you are imagining things. He continues with a lecture about "noisy outsiders who try to come in and start riots." Tell him what you think.

4. You have been looking forward to your vacation next week for a long time. You were lucky to get the only reservation at a cabin which is unavailable for the next three months. Your boss tells you he had forgotten that he had promised it to you and has given the time off to someone else. Tell him how you feel about this.

5. Your toilet is stopped up and has been all afternoon. You had called the plumber and he said he'd be right out. The bathroom is now flooded and he arrives four hours late. Say what you feel about this.

6. Your neighbor's dog continually comes over and digs in your flowers. Today your neighbor is in your front yard talking to you. He is laughing at his dog's behavior as the dog destroys what's left of your flower bed. Tell him how you feel.

7. You are at a friend's house. The friend, being a practical joker, pulls a chair out from under you as you are about to sit down. Tell him what you think of this.

8. You have a very important engagement this evening, and the cleaner has promised to have your only suit ready at 5:00. You go into the shop and find the cleaner asleep in a chair in the corner. You ask him about your suit, and he says that he just hasn't had time to get it finished. Tell him what you think.

9. A child in your family has seriously gashed his leg in an accident and you attempt to telephone a physician. The "town gossip" is on the telephone party line and tells you to "get lost" and stop interfering with her "constitutional rights" to use the party line. Tell her how you feel.

10. You feel that it is very important that you vote for the candidate of your choice in the county election. You don't mind standing in line for several hours to cast your vote, but just as your turn comes the clerk gets up to close the door and tells you that you're too late. Answer him.

11. You have been at work all day and a friend had promised to pick you up and take you home at 5:00. It's 6:30 now and he finally arrives. Tell him what you feel about this.

12. You have discovered a simple, workable way to save time for yourself and others in the company. Carefully you document and write up the new method which could result in significant company-wide savings. About a week later your foreman tells you he threw the suggestion out and to stop trying to be the boss around here. Answer with how you feel.

13. For a long time you have been making "lay-a-way" payments on a special gift for a family member. On the date you promised, you go to the store to make your final payment and pick up the purchase. The store-keeper tells you that he has sold the item to someone else, not knowing how long it would take you to make your last payment. He then adds insult to injury by complaining about lay-a-way buyers being such an "unpredict-able bunch." Answer him.

14. A child in the family is having a good time at the beach, splashing water and playing in the sand. Nearby, a stranger is asleep on the sand and the child mistakes him for an older family member and starts cover-ing his feet with sand. The person awakes and begins cursing the child in violent language. Say what you think about him.

15. Your new set of tires continually leak air. Several times you have asked the tire salesman to either fix or replace them. You wake up on vacation morning to find two of them flat, and this is upsetting as the fam-ily is anxious to leave. The salesman accuses you of "hot rodding it" or of otherwise abusing the tires. He tells you, furthermore, that he is tired of "fooling" with you -- that you are "impossible." Tell him what you feel.

16. Over a period of a year you have been taking special courses to pre-pare for an opening that is to come since another worker is soon to retire. The opening comes and the boss comes by and tells you he has promoted his "bosom buddy" and belittles your qualifications. Answer him.

17. A pregnant woman enters a train that you are riding and there is no seat for her. You motion for her to come to take yours, whereupon an athletic-looking teenager brushes her aside and takes the seat. Say some-thing to him.

18.   For several years you arrive at work one-half hour early, yet one morning your clock is wrong and you come in 15 minutes late.   Your boss reprimands you and tells you that he is tired of people being late and plans to "make an example" of you and to "teach others not to come in late."   Tell him what you feel.

19.   During the last several years your work has been multiplying although you have organized it as well as you can.   Finally you realize you cannot take much more (you have even become a "beast" at home) and you take the matter to the boss.   You are laughed at and told further that you just need to work harder.   Let him know how you feel.

20.   A friend has had "a little too much to drink" but you finally persuade him to let you take him home.   At his door, however, one of his family members refuses to let him in, turning to you and calling you a "no good so and so" who got him drunk in the first place.   Answer.

---

*Adapted from Wagner (1968b).

SITUATIONS, VARIED-1

1. Your teenage son failed to graduate from high school last year. He spent too much time on dating and football practice and too little time on studying. He is now spending less time on dating and has given up football. He is doing well in school and expects to graduate in the near future. Tell him how you feel.

2. You have been arrested for a crime you did not commit. Your attorney is now visiting you in jail and has just told you that it will take all your savings to prepare your defense. Tell how you feel.

3. While you are backing your car in a small parking space, you step on the accelerator instead of the brake. Your car then smashes the entire front end of the car behind you. You have no money or insurance to cover the cost of repairs. The owner of the damaged car is approaching you. Explain how you feel about the situation.

4. You have serious money problems. You are unable to pay your monthly bills and you are about to have your home repossessed after making payments for five years. Then one day your boss tells you that you have been given a promotion with a very large increase in salary. Express your feelings.

5. You are a job supervisor who must inform an employee that he is no longer needed. You know he has been a very good worker and has a large family. Give him the layoff notice and tell him how you feel about the situation.

6. You have just finished moving your furnishings and family into a new house. When the last box is unpacked and put away, a man arrives at the house and states that you made the mistake of moving into the wrong house and will have to move again. Explain your feelings about the situation.

7. You have discovered a method to save time and money for your company. When you tell your foreman about your idea, he immediately puts it to use throughout the plant. A week later you hear the plant manager praise your foreman for discovering the new method. The foreman admits that it was your idea and asks that you be given a pay raise. Tell your foreman how you feel about his action.

8. You have had an accident on the job and seriously cut your hand. You are rushed to the emergency room of the nearest hospital. When you arrive you are placed at the end of a long line of emergency victims. Explain your feelings to the person in line before you.

9. You borrow an expensive non-replaceable tool from your best friend. After using it for a short time, you damage it beyond repair. You return it to your friend who then appears very sad about the loss of the tool. Tell your friend how you feel about the matter.

10. You lose your wallet which contains a whole month's pay in cash, some credit cards, drivers' license, etc. A few days later a man in work clothes knocks on the door of your home and returns the wallet. Tell how you feel.

11. You work for a small company which is on the verge of bankruptcy. While doing your job one day, you make a mistake which you know will cause the company to go out of business. The company president has just called you into his office. Tell him how you feel about the whole situation.

12. You are an automobile repairman who has made a faulty brake repair. The customer is now telling you that your poor repair work has resulted in his having an accident and suffering a broken leg. Tell how you feel.

13. You refused to give permission to your teenager to go to a dance in a rough neighborhood. Later, while driving home from the movies, you hear that the dance was raided by a vice squad and that many young people were arrested. The thought occurs to you that your teenager might have gone to the dance against your wishes. When you arrive home, you find that your teenager has been home all the while doing helpful chores. Tell how you feel.

14. Your teenager has been looking very tired and very unhealthy for the past several months. One day you ask him if he has been taking dope and he answers "yes." Tell how you feel.

15. Your job supervisor must choose between you and one of his relatives in giving out a job promotion. You know that if he doesn't choose his relative he will hear many complaints from his family. He gives you the promotion because you are better qualified for the job. Express your feelings.

16. You are having dinner at a friend's home when you spill a large bowl of soup. The soup runs all over the table, your chair and onto a very expensive rug. Your friend looks horrified and hurriedly begins to clean up the mess. Tell how you feel.

17. You have agreed to drive an unemployed friend downtown for a job interview. You arrive late because you became too involved in watching a TV news program. Your friend may now be too late to get the job. Express your feelings.

18.   You are having trouble with the automatic transmission of your car which you need to get to work. You take it to a repairman who tells you that the car needs a completely new transmission. Since you have very little money, and desperately need the car, you ask a mechanic friend for help. He finds that an adjustment and some additional fluid are all that is needed to get the transmission to operate smoothly. He does not charge for his work. Tell how you feel.

19.   You are a railroad policeman who discovers an illegal rider in a freight car. You must tell him to get off the train. He tells you that he is very ill, has no money, and must get to the hospital in the nearest town. Express your feelings.

20.   Your teenager has finally made some close friends after years of loneliness. You must now say that your job requires you to move the family to another town. Express your feelings about the problem.

OUTLINE OF EXPRESSIVE TRAINING PROCEDURES (FORM 2)

SESSION 1

>   Evaluation roleplays (RP's)   (3)*   III A
>
>   Instructions for Feeling Word List (FWL) and Anger Situation List (ASL)   (15+)   III B

SESSION 2

>   Disc. of habitual means of communicating feelings   (15+)   IV A
>
>   RP using (ASL)   (3)   IV C

SESSION 3

>   Disc. of patient training goals   (15+)   V A
>
>   Coordinator models coach's role for RP   (15+)
>
>   RP using Varied Situation List (VSL)   (3)   V D
>
>   Preparation for slightly difficult extra-group expression   (3)   V E
>
>   Preparation for writing slightly difficult problem situation for next session   (3)   V H

SESSION 4

>   Disc. of previous extra-group expression   (3)   VI B
>
>   Preparation and RP of slightly difficult extra-group expression   (3)   VI
>
>   Discussion of "not expressing feelings"   (15+)

SESSION 5

>   Expression of feelings about controversial statements   (5-10)
>
>   Disc. of FWL   (5-10)   V F
>
>   Coordinator models coaching role for RP   (15+)
>
>   RP of moderately difficult outside expression   (3)   VI D

SESSION 6

    Disc. of "where feeling-cause statements are useful"   (15+)

    RP of fairly difficult situation--S directs role play   (3)   VII C

SESSION 7

    Expression of feelings about patients' problem situations   (5-10)
      VIII E

    Coordinator models coaching for "job interview"   (15+)

    RP of job interviews or other anticipated problem situations   (3)

*Size of group

COACH'S INSTRUCTIONS

DISCUSSION

Require explicit feeling-cause (F-C) statements

TRIAL ROLE PLAY

Allow acceptable role plays to end before giving feedback

Score F-C's and distractors

Interrupt unacceptable role plays to ask questions, model, direct behavior, etc.

Have opposer give feedback on F-C's and distractors

Coach gives same feedback emphasizing appropriate responses

TEST ROLE PLAY

No feedback is given until role play is finished

Have Opposer give feedback on F-C's and distractors

Coach gives same feedback emphasizing appropriate responses

EXPRESSOR'S INSTRUCTIONS

DISCUSSION

Report your feeling and causes (F-C's)

TRIAL ROLE PLAY

Use F-C statements

Avoid distractors

Stop when F-C's are expressed

Get feedback from your group

TEST ROLE PLAY

Move to new group

Use instructions for trial role play

OPPOSER'S INSTRUCTIONS

DISCUSSION

Insist on clear feeling-cause (F-C) statements by expressor

TRIAL ROLE PLAY

Provoke strong F's

Roleplay C's clearly

Pay close attention to expressor and don't interrupt him

Ask for F's or C's if necessary

Give feedback to expressor

TEST ROLE PLAY

Use instructions for trial role play -- but omit asking for F's and C's

EXPRESSIVE BEHAVIOR RECORD

Name _____ Date _____

Time Coach Activ.	Situation	Feelings	Causes	Misc. =X Criticisms=C Threats =T Demands =D

APPENDIX D

TESTING MATERIALS[1]

---

[1]All of the materials contained in this appendix, unless otherwise noted, were written jointly with Dr. Paul Kirwin.

PROBLEM STATEMENT[1]

Our goal here at the hospital is to try and make you feel more comfortable and to work with you so that you will have a better understanding of yourself. In order to do this, we will need to know more about how you feel about different things and how you see various situations. We have found these tests that you are about to take very helpful in providing some of the information we need to know in order to be able to best help you. Please fill all of them out as completely as you can and return them as quickly as possible to the person who gave them to you or to any of the nurses.

It is very important for you to complete the tests by yourself. We are only interested in your answers, not in those of other persons.

Date_____ Name _____ Birthdate _____

Birthplace _____ Highest School Grade Completed ____

Usual Occupation _____ Marital Status: single
married _____
etc.

In a few sentences, describe what the events were that caused you to come to the hospital. What do you hope will happen or be different as the result of coming to the hospital?

_____

[1] From standard psychological intake battery, V.A. Hospital, Durham, N. C.

FEELING WORD IDENTIFICATION INVENTORY

NAME _____   DATE _____

Instructions: Please circle all words which refer to feelings.

afraid	amused	apathetic
bored	calm	choosy
cultured	careless	concerned
cunning	charming	deceptive
dishonest	contented	graceful
embarrassed	fat	insolent
hopeless	fussy	pity
rich	modest	pleased
rowdy	resentful	turned on
witty	uneasy	wonder

"SELF" FEELING EXPRESSION INVENTORY

Name _____   Date _____

Your electrically heated home is struck by a power failure during 20-degree weather. You and two other persons in your family have influenza and may be seriously harmed by the cold. Your neighbor comes to your house to invite your whole family to stay in his fireplace-heated den, until the power returns.

In the space below list all of your feelings about this situation, and number the feelings 1, 2, etc.

In the space below, describe the causes for each of the feelings listed in the column at the left. Number each to indicate the associated feeling.

Now circle all statements which you believe you would actually express to your neighbor.

"SELF" FEELING EXPRESSION INVENTORY (continued)

Your neighbor has in the past few months borrowed your lawn rake, pruning shears, a hammer and several other items, but hasn't returned anything yet. Your neighbor now comes to your house asking to borrow your camera to use on a vacation out of town.

In the space below list all of your feelings about this situation, and number the feelings 1, 2, etc.

In the space below, describe the causes for each of the feelings listed in the column at the left. Number each to indicate the associated feeling.

_____

Now circle all statements which you believe you would actually express to your neighbor.

"OTHER" FEELING EXPRESSION INVENTORY

Name _____ Date _____

1. Mr. Jones had been kept awake by his neighbor's dog's howling for
    two nights. When Mr. Jones inquired about the dog's howling, the
    neighbor replied that the dog was being forced to get accustomed to
    sleeping outside during the cold winter nights.

    Mr. Jones answered as follows:

    I feel that you should be concerned about your dog's keeping me awake
    at night. I am irritated about losing sleep the past two nights. Fur-
    thermore, I am worried about the dog's having been exposed to the
    cold for two nights in a row. You seem a bit inconsiderate about the
    dog's health. Perhaps I should check with the Humane Society about
    keeping the dog out in the cold all night.

    Please indicate Mr. Jones' feelings and their causes in the two col-
    umns below:

Feelings	Causes

"OTHER" FEELING EXPRESSION INVENTORY (continued)

2. Mary Smith had a flat tire late one night on a deserted road. While examining the tire, she heard footsteps approaching a short distance from the car. A man appeared who, with Mary's permission, quickly replaced the damaged tire.

Before driving on, Mary made the following comments:

I feel they should have a repair truck patrolling this road. I was very relieved when you stopped to help me. I should pay you for your efforts. I really appreciate your changing the tire. Would you like a ride?

Please indicate Mary Smith's feelings and their causes in the two columns below:

Feelings	Causes

148

ZUNG SCALE

	None or a little of the time	Some of the time	Good part of the time	Most or all of the time
1. I feel down-hearted and blue				
2. Morning is when I feel the best				
3. I have crying spells or feel like it				
4. I have trouble sleeping at night				
5. I eat as much as I used to				
6. I still enjoy sex				
7. I notice that I am losing weight				
8. I have trouble with constipation				
9. My heart beats faster than usual				
10. I get tired for no reason				
11. My mind is as clear as it used to be				
12. I find it easy to do the things I used to				
13. I am restless and can't keep still				
14. I feel hopeful about the future				
15. I am more irritable than usual				
16. I find it easy to make decisions				
17. I feel that I am useful and needed				
18. My life is pretty full				
19. I feel that others would be better off if I were dead				
20. I still enjoy the things I used to do				

APPENDIX E

SCORING MANUAL FOR FEELING-CAUSE STATEMENTS[*]

I. Criteria for feeling responses

  A. Self reference

  B. Verbal feeling responses
    1. Systematic considerations
    2. Construction of the master scoring list

  C. Scoring categories for feeling responses
    1. Category 1: I feel
    2. Category 2: Unclear feeling responses
    3. Category 3: Clear feeling responses

II. Criteria for causal statements

  A. Causal statements
    1. Verbal comments made by others
    2. Verbal comments made by self in presence of others
    3. Overt actions made by self or others
    4. Internal sensations
    5. Externally produced sensations

  B. Statements not accepted as causes
    1. One's own thoughts or feelings
    2. Thoughts, attitudes, motives attributed to others but not verbalized by them
    3. Classes of objects or events, generalizations
    4. Predicted events which have not yet occurred

  C. Scoring categories for causal statements
    1. Category 1: Unclear causal statements
    2. Category 2: Clear causal statements

III. Criteria for feeling-cause connections

    A. Category 1: Unclear feeling-cause connections

    B. Category 2: Clear feeling-cause connections

IV. Criteria for distractor words

V. Data sheet for scoring feeling-cause connections

---

*Written jointly with Dr. Paul Kirwin.

I. Criteria for Feeling Responses

A. Self Reference

A primary criterion of feeling statements is that the feelings

expressed be attributed to one's self. Satisfactory self reference

is indicated by the use of first-person singular personal pronouns,

e.g., I, my, myself, mine.

B. Verbal Feeling Responses

1. Systematic Considerations

The following discussion is intended to define and describe

the domain of verbal feeling responses. The content of the dis-

cussion is based on an empirical study of responses to feeling-

words and a series of "notes toward a theory of emotion" prepared

by Davitz (1969).

The construct of feeling or emotion refers to a class of

more specific states which are commonly identified by such labels

as anger, love, excitement, etc. Members of a given language

group will exhibit a degree of consensus in identifying words which

are likely to be used as labels for emotions. Table I contains a

sample of words which more than half of a group of forty raters

agreed were labels for emotional states (Davitz, 1969).

There is also consensus about the range of experiences

referred to by a given feeling label. An empirically derived

dictionary of emotional meaning has been prepared by Davitz (1969).

Feeling words may be formed into groups according to similarities in the responses they elicit. For example, the words "love" and "affection" both evoke references to physical closeness (Davitz, 1969). Table I illustrates the formation of word groups (numbered 1 thru 12) on the basis of response similarities.

The particular arrangement of the word groups in Table I is the result of a number of statistical and conceptual considerations. Cluster analysis of response pattern similarities for the individual feeling words yielded the twelve clusters in Table I. A principal components analysis of these twelve clusters resulted in three factors: Row 1--Positive; Row 2--Negative Type 1; and Row 3--Negative Type 2. Placement of a cluster in a particular column and the labels used for word groups and column headings were derived from the abstracted content of the items.

2. Construction of the Master Scoring List

To facilitate the identification of feeling words in language samples, a relatively extensive master scoring list was constructed. The list of words in Table I was expanded by additional words obtained from one prepared by Green and Marlatt (1971), and from Roget's Thesaurus (Mawson, 1940). A small number of the words added are idiomatic and were obtained from responses given to a feeling-expression test used in studies conducted earlier by the

TABLE I

FEELING WORDS CATEGORIZED BY LEVELS OF
DESCRIPTIVE DIMENSIONS

Level of Activation	Relatedness	Hedonic Tone	Competence
(1) Activation	(2) Moving Toward	(3) Comfort	(4) Enhancement
Admiration	Affection	Contentment	Confidence
Amusement	Love	Determination	Inspiration
Awe		Friendliness	Pride
Cheerfulness		Gratitude	
Delight		Reverence	
Elation		Serenity	
Enjoyment			
Gaiety			
Happiness			
Hope			
(5) Hypoactivation	(6) Moving Away	(7) Discomfort	(8) Incompetence: Dissatisfaction
Boredom	Apathy	Grief	Guilt
Depression		Pity	Remorse
		Sadness	Shame
(9) Hyperactivation	(10) Moving Against	(11) Tension	(12) Inadequacy
Anger	Contempt	Disgust	Anxiety
Fear	Dislike	Frustration	
Panic	Hate	Impatience	
		Irritation	
		Jealousy	
		Nervousness	
		Resentment	

Adapted from tables given by Davitz (1969, p. 125).

present authors. The entire list was presented to six raters, all of whom agreed that the words therein were likely to be indicative of emotional states. The master scoring list is given in Table II. Any word which appears to be a close synonym to one appearing in the Table II list is considered a feeling word for purposes of training and test scoring.

C. Scoring Categories for Feeling Responses

For the purpose of differentiating among feeling responses which vary in communicative effectiveness, three scoring categories are used.

1. Category 1: I feel

The word feel is considered a minimally communicative feeling response and is given a Category 1 score. Some common examples are:

"I feel like doing that."

"I feel it was a nice thing for you to do."

It may be noted that the word feel in the two preceding examples is not followed by feeling words. Instead, the first statement contains an action phrase (doing that) and the second contains an evaluative phrase (nice thing, etc.). Nevertheless, the use of the word feel is considered an attempt, albeit a weak one, to communicate feeling and is given the minimal Category 1 score.

TABLE II

WORD LIST FOR DESCRIPTION OF FEELINGS

Unpleasurable

abhor	frustrated	unhappy
afraid (of)	grief	unsociable
aggravated	guilty	upset
alienated	hate toward	
angry	helpless	Pleasurable
anxious	hopeless	
apathetic	humiliated	admiration
apprehensive (about, over)	hurt	affectionate
ashamed	impatient	amused
bad mood	indifferent	at ease
blue	inhibited	attracted
bored	irritated	beautiful
bothered	jealous	calm
bugged	loathing	care for
confused	lonely	cheerful
contemptuous	low/down	comforted
coolness toward	mad (at)	confident
depressed	nasty	content
disappointed	nervous	delighted
discontented	panic	elated
discouraged	regretful	enjoyment
disgusted	remorseful	enthusiastic
disillusioned	resentful	excited
dislike	revengeful	faith
displeased	sad	friendly
dissatisfied	shame	fulfilled
disturbed	sorrowed	gaiety
distrusting	suspicious	glad
dull	troubled	good
embarrassed	ugly	happy
envious	uncomfortable	high
fear	unconcerned	hopeful
flustered	uneasy	inspired
frightened	unfriendly	joyful

TABLE II (continued)

Pleasurable (continued)

like	astonished
love toward	awed
pleased	cautious
proud	concerned
relaxed	courageous
relieved	cowardly
respect	determined
satisfied	flabbergasted
serene	forgiving
sociable	grateful
touched	humble
trusting	indifferent
turned on	kindness toward
wanted	mixed feelings
warmth	pity
welcome	reckless
	reverence
Other	solemn
	surprised
apathetic	sympathetic
appreciative	thankful
aroused	wonder
arrogant	

2. Category 2: Unclear Feeling Responses

Responses which connote feeling but which may also be construed to have non-affective meanings are given Category 2 scores.

Expressions of agreement or disagreement are considered unclear feeling expressions because they may be understood to be presentations of ideas (cognitions) or disclosures of feeling (affects), or both. Consider the following:

"I agree with your report."

The above statement may be construed to mean "I think the report is accurate," or "I have a positive feeling about the report," or both.

Expressions concerning wants, desires, needs, or intentions are considered unclear feeling expressions because they may be interpreted as references to thoughts (cognitions) as well as feelings (affects). For example:

"When the clock struck five, I knew I needed food."

The above example may be interpreted as "the clock striking five caused me to think I should eat," or "the clock striking five caused me to become aware of a felt desire for food," or both.

The use of the word thanks provides another example of unclear feeling expression. For illustration:

"Thanks for helping me."

The above statement could be merely a social formality.

"I feel thankful for your help" would be a clearer expression of feeling and would receive a higher category score (see Category 3).

3. Category 3: Clear Feeling Responses

Responses which clearly and unequivocally communicate feeling states are given Category 3 scores. Some examples are:

"I am discouraged."

"I feel very content."

"I hate it."

In the above examples, the underlined words meet the criteria for feeling responses. The grammatical function of the feeling word may vary. Thus, the feeling word serves as a predicate adjective in the first and second of the examples given, and as a verb in the third.

II. Criteria for Causal Statements

A. Causal Statements

For scoring purposes, a causal statement is a word or group of words which refers to a specific internal or external stimulus event. Causal statements are counted only when they appear in sentences containing feeling responses. A basic requirement of causal statements is that they refer to events which have already occurred or are in process. A second requirement of causal statements is that they refer to events which are potentially recordable by devices such as the camera, sound recorder, etc. It is not anticipated that an event claimed to be the cause for a feeling will be the only contributor to the feeling in question. The Subject's previous experience with similar events will likely have an effect on any current emotional response. However, it is sufficient that the Subject identify one or more of the events which appear to him to trigger or precipitate a particular feeling.

Five broad categories of acceptable causal statements and illustrations for each category are given below. The examples consist of complete feeling-cause statements with feeling words underlined and causes enclosed within parentheses.

1. Verbal Comments Made by Others

"(Your remark about me being irresponsible) makes me angry."

"I <u>don't like</u> (what you just said)."

2. <u>Vocalizations Made by Self in Presence of Others</u>

"I am <u>glad</u> (I said hello to him)."

Vocalizations made in the absence of others are not counted. Such vocalizations are very much like private thoughts which also are <u>not</u> counted as causal statements. Therefore, indication of the presence of others during the vocalization must be given for the statement to be counted.

3. <u>Overt Actions Made by Self or Others</u>

"(Your last gesture) <u>frightened</u> me."

"It <u>felt good</u> when (I slept late yesterday)."

4. <u>Internal Sensations</u>

"I became <u>scared</u> (when my heart started to beat rapidly)."

"(The pain in my neck) <u>annoys</u> me."

5. <u>Externally Produced Sensations from Objects, Events, People, etc.</u>

"I was <u>delighted</u> (to see him)."

"(This book) <u>confuses</u> me."

"I was <u>startled</u> (when the light came on suddenly)."

B. Statements Not Accepted as Causes

1. One's Own Thoughts or Feelings

"(My thought about you) made me feel good."

"(The fear aroused in me by my father's

comment) made me sad."

In the latter example, the feeling of fear is given as the

cause for the feeling of sadness. However, the father's comment

could be considered the cause for both feelings. The object of

expressive training is to find relations between feeling states and

objectively recordable stimuli, rather than those occurring be-

tween feeling states.

2. Thoughts, Attitudes, Qualities, Motives, etc., Attributed

to Others

"(Your dislike of me) upsets me."

"(Your attitude toward my new suit)

irritates me."

"I am happy (you are so nice)."

"I have doubts about (your motives in this

matter)."

3. Classes of Objects or Events, Generalizations, etc.

"I like (dogs)."

"I enjoy (tennis)."

"(Your entire personality) turns me off."

"I am mad because (you are always late)."

4. <u>Predicted Events Which Have Not Yet Occurred</u>

"I am <u>afraid</u> that (she will not like me when

she sees me)."

"I'll be <u>disappointed</u> (if you don't come)."

C. <u>Scoring Categories for Causal Statements</u>

Two scoring categories are used to indicate the extent to

which causal statements conform to scoring criteria.

1. <u>Category 1: Unclear Causal Statements</u>

Causal statements which contain unacceptable elements

are given Category 1 scores. In the following examples, the un-

acceptable elements are enclosed in single quotes.

"I was <u>glad</u> (that he 'was nice enough to' let

me use his car)."

The phrase 'was nice enough to' is an attributed quality

which is unacceptable in causal statements. If the contaminating

phrase were omitted, the remaining causal statement "let me use

his car" would conform to the scoring criteria and be given a

Category 2 score (see below).

"I'm <u>irritated</u> (because you 'dishonestly'

refused to repay your loan)."

Here the word 'dishonestly' suggests an attributed motive,

which is unacceptable in a causal statement. If the word 'dis-

honestly' were omitted, the remaining causal statement, "refused to repay your loan" would conform to scoring criteria and be given a Category 2 score (see below).

2. Category 2: Clear Causal Statements

Causal statements which conform to scoring criteria and are not contaminated by unacceptable elements such as generalizations, attributions, etc., are given Category 2 scores.

III. Criteria for Feeling-Cause Connections

Two scoring categories are used to indicate the degree of clarity of the connection or relationship between feelings and causes.

A. Category 1: Unclear Feeling-Cause Connections

If the relationship between the feeling and cause in a statement is unclear, the feeling-cause connection is given a Category 1 score.

> "(My son has not worked this month, has
> wrecked my car, and did not talk it over
> with me), which I resent."

For the above example, it is possible to speculate about which particular event or events triggered the feeling of resentment. Any or all of the three events listed may have been the immediate cause for resentment.

> "Yesterday you (brought me flowers). That
> really pleased me."

In the latter example, the cause (brought flowers) and the feeling (pleased) appear in separate sentences. The relationship between feeling and cause thereby becomes less clear than would be the case if one sentence contained both feeling and cause.

B. Category 2: Clear Feeling-Cause Connections

If the stated relationship between a feeling and cause is clear

and unequivocable, the feeling-cause connection is given a Category 2 score.

> "The (rainy weather) is making me <u>gloomy</u>."

> "(When you graduated from college), I felt
>
> very <u>proud</u>."

> "I really <u>like</u> (this ice cream cone)."

In each of the above three examples, there is only one reasonable interpretation of what caused the expressed feeling.

IV. Criteria for Distractor Words

One objective of expressive training is to help a speaker attain the option of increasing the feeling-cause content of his speech while decreasing all other content. The rationale underlying this objective is that any word or phrase in a statement which does not help the speaker and listener focus on feeling-cause relations may have distracting effects. Threats, demands, criticism, attributions to others of thoughts, motives, etc., and "small talk," are common "distractors." All words which do not appear to be integral parts of feeling or causal statements are counted as distractor words.

In some sentences, none of the words refer to feelings or causes. All words contained in the sentence are therefore counted as distractors. For example:

"I'm going to report your error to your

supervisor." (Threat)

"Don't you dare say that again." (Demand,

threat)

"It was foolish of you to drive here in bad

weather." (Criticism)

"I'll bet I fascinate you." (Attribution of

thought or feeling to another)

In some sentences, only a portion of the words are counted as distractors. For example:

"I'm glad you 'so courageously' stayed

in the game."

The words 'so courageously' are counted as distractor words because they refer to an attributed quality, and are not acceptable as part of the causal statement (stayed in the game).

V. Data Sheet for Scoring Feeling-Cause Statements

Identification of Material Scored	1 Dis-tractor Words	2 Feel	3 Uncl. Feel'g	4 Clear Feel'g	5 Uncl. Cause	6 Clear Cause	7 Uncl. Connection	8 Clear Connection

Scorer _____

REFERENCES

Davitz, J. K. The language of emotion. New York: Academic Press,
1969.

Green, A. H., and Marlatt, G. A. Effects of instructions and modeling
upon affective and descriptive self-references. Paper presented
at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, San
Francisco, April, 1971.

Mawson, C. O. (Ed.) Roget's international thesaurus of English words
and phrases. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1940.

APPENDIX F

ADDITIONAL SCORING NOTES[1]

---

[1]Written jointly with Dr. Paul Kirwin.

ADDITIONAL SCORING NOTES: F-C
("Self" Feeling Expression Inventory)

GENERAL GUIDELINES:

1. Every word written on the page is evaluated.

2. Numbering:
    a. If the subject has numbered his feelings and causes, we
        will conform to his numbering.
    b. If the left and right column parallel spacing seems to
        indicate connections between feelings and causes, we
        will number accordingly.
    c. If neither a nor b is true, we will begin numbering down
        in the left column, then go on to the right, breaking
        numbers by sentences.
    d. The exception to a-c occurs when two feelings are given
        in one sentence. We will then number them separately
        (e.g., 1a and 1b) in order to make the scoring of both
        possible.

3. Counting words:
    a. Contractions are counted as 1 word.
    b. Abbreviations such as 40%, $15, etc., are counted as
        two words.

IC. SCORING CATEGORIES FOR FEELING RESPONSES

    2. Category 2: Unclear feeling responses
            In a statement such as "I wanted to hit him (because he
        hit me)," all underlined words are considered part of the
        feeling clause, while those in parentheses are the cause.
            The phrase I don't know . . . does not qualify as an un-
        clear feeling.

    4. Additional notes
        a. Compound feelings are numbered as in 2d above, e.g.,
            1a and 1b. Then causes, connections, and distractors
            are scored twice.

            EXAMPLE:

            (1a) happy and (1b) surprised   that the man was so
                                                 kind as to fix my tire.

            (1a) 5 dist. 4 5 8
            (1b) 5 dist. 4 5 8

b. "I feel that I would feel" or "I think that I would feel" are all considered part of the feeling clause (not dis- tractors), since the test seems to pull for this kind of prefacing of the answer.

c. Feelings considered by the thesaurus to be synonyms are only scored once, if they appear in the same sen- tence.

EXAMPLE:

happy and glad   that the man fixed my tire.

0 dist. 4 6 8

d. Feelings which are given by the thesaurus as synonyms, but which the subject has written as two separate entries, are scored twice.

EXAMPLE:

(1) happy   that the man fixed my tire.
(2) glad   that the man came when he did.

(1) 0 dist. 4 6 8
(2) 0 dist. 4 6 8

IIC. SCORING CATEGORIES FOR CAUSAL STATEMENTS

3. Additional notes
    a. Causes are scored only when either an unclear feeling (category 3) or a clear feeling (category 4) response has first been scored.

    b. Causal clauses such as "I am angry (about what you just did)" or "I am concerned (about my wife)" are not con- sidered specific enough to be scored as clear causes.

    c. In the example below, the subject may or may not mean the contingency implied by use of the word "and." We will score compound clauses as if the contingency is implied, since the person could have either made two sentences or omitted either part of the compound clause, if a different meaning was intended.

EXAMPLE:

happy   that the man came in five minutes
                         and fixed my tire (so competently.)

2 dist. 4 5 8

IV. CRITERIA FOR DISTRACTOR WORDS

a. Words such as "toward him" or "at him" may direct the
    listener's attention away from his actions and toward
    his "personality." Therefore, they are counted as dis-
    tractor words.

    EXAMPLE:

    "I felt angry (toward him) (for not bringing back my
    tools)."

    2 dist. 4 6 8

b. Distractor words are noted by being circled.

ADDITIONAL SCORING NOTES: F-C
(Interviews)

GENERAL GUIDELINES:

1. Only those sentences given by the S̲ which are between the black parentheses are evaluated.

2. Of these sentences, only those sentences containing some scorable feeling component are actually scored. The remaining sentences are indicated as distractors and it is not necessary to count individual words.

3. Numbering:
    In general each sentence (indicated by a period, semi-colon, or slash mark) is numbered, unless:
    a. Two scorable feeling components are contained in one sentence or
    b. The feeling phrase is in one sentence and the associated cause is in the next sentence.
    In these instances we utilize a, b, etc.

4. Counting words
    a. Contractions are counted as one word.
    b. Abbreviations such as 40%, $15, etc., are counted as two words.
    c. "Uhs" and "ums" are counted as words.
    d. Names are counted as one word (e.g., Roger Brown = 1).
    e. Titles are also counted as one word (e.g., Mr. Roger Brown = 2).

IC. SCORING CATEGORIES FOR FEELING RESPONSES

2. Category 2: Unclear feeling responses
    a. In a statement such as "I wanted to hit him (because he hit me)", all underlined words are considered part of the feeling clause, while those in parentheses are the cause.
    b. The phrase "I don't know . . ." does not qualify as an unclear feeling.

4. Additional notes

    a. Compound feelings are numbered as in 3a above, e.g., 1a and 1b. Then causes, connections, and distractors are scored twice.

      EXAMPLE:

      "I am (1a) happy and (1b) surprised (that the man was so kind as to fix my tire)."

      (1a) 5 dist. 4 5 8
      (1b) 5 dist. 4 5 8

    b. "I feel that I would feel" or "I think that I would feel" are now scored as distractors, because they are futuristic (see 4f below).

    c. Feelings considered by the thesaurus to be synonyms are only scored once, if they appear in the same sentence.

      EXAMPLE:

      "I am happy and glad (that the man fixed my tire)."

      0 dist. 4 6 8

    d. Feelings which are given by the thesaurus as synonyms, but which the S has written as two entries, are scored twice.

      EXAMPLE:

      (1) "I was happy (that the man fixed my tire)." (2) "I was also glad (that the man fixed my tire)."

      (1) 0 dist. 4 6 8
      (2) 0 dist. 4 6 8

    e. Instances where additional words might be considered part of the feeling phrase:
      1. "For example, I am angry (because you just hit me)." 0 dist. 4 6 8
      2. "I am concerned about your coming late (because the train has just left)." 0 dist. 4 6 8
      3. "I am concerned (about your coming late)." 0 dist. 4 6 8
      4. "I am angry at him (because he hit me)." 2 dist. 4 6 8

Each scorer will have to make his own decisions about the extent to which the words add to or distract from the feeling. However, remember that the general goal is to have the person give his feelings and their causes in as <u>few</u> and as <u>specific</u> words as possible.

f. A feeling word is scored in categories 3 or 4 only if the rater judges that it is a <u>presently</u> or <u>previously</u> experienced feeling. Any futuristic feeling word is counted as a distractor.

1. "I get depressed sometimes." 4 dist. (futuristic)
2. "It bothers me when I have to go home so late." 11 dist. (fut.)
3. "It bothers me that I have to go home now." 7 dist. 4 (present)
4. "I liked my job." 2 dist. 4 (past feeling)
5. "My medicine relaxes me." 4 dist. (futuristic)
6. "I was talking to you out of anger." 5 dist. 4 (past feeling)
7. "I just worried myself to death." 3 dist. 4 (past feeling)
8. "I get nervous." 3 dist. (futuristic)

g. Feeling phrases may contain words that do not refer to <u>specific</u> events. Such words are scored as distractors.

1. "I've had periods of distrust." 2 dist. 4 (past feeling)
2. "My life was happy." 2 dist. 4 (past feeling)

IIC. SCORING CATEGORIES FOR CAUSAL STATEMENTS

3. Additional notes
   a. Causes are scored only when either an unclear feeling (category 3) or a clear feeling (category 4) response has first been scored.

   b. Causal clauses such as "<u>I am angry</u> (about what you just did)" or "<u>I am concerned</u> (about my wife)" are not considered specific enough to be scored as clear causes.

c. In the example below, the subject may or may not mean the contingency implied by use of the word "and." We will score compound clauses as if the contingency <u>is</u> implied, since the person could have either made two sentences or omitted either part of the compound clause, if a different meaning was intended.

EXAMPLE:

"<u>I am happy</u> (that the man came in five minutes and fixed my tire) (so competently)."

2 dist. 4 5 8

d. Any futuristic cause is scored as distractors.

EXAMPLE:

"<u>I am happy</u> (that I will go to O.T. tomorrow)."

7 dist. 4

Even though the cause is a specific action, it is a futuristic thought and therefore scored as distraction.

IV. CRITERIA FOR DISTRACTOR WORDS

a. Words such as "toward him" or "at him" may direct the listener's attention away from his actions and toward his "personality." Therefore, they are counted as distractor words.

EXAMPLE:

"<u>I felt angry</u> (toward him) (for not bringing back my tools)."

2 dist. 4 6 8

b. Distractor words are noted by being circled.

APPENDIX G

SCORING MANUAL FOR "OTHER" FEELING

EXPRESSION INVENTORY[*]

I. Feeling Words

One point is given for each feeling word which is identified in the text. Some form of the word used in the text must be written in the answer column. Synonyms are not scored.

Examples of feeling responses given a score of one:

Positive Expression:
1. relief, relieved
2. appreciation, appreciate, appreciated

Negative Expression:
1. irritation, irritated, irritable
2. worry, worried

II. Clear Causes

Clear causes given must be complete and closely conform to the wording of the causes given in the text of the test to get two points.

Examples of causes given a score of two:

Positive Expression:

relieved-
1. (when he stopped) (to help her)
2. (when he stopped) (and helped her)
3. (when he stopped) (and offered to help her)

appreciate-
1. (his changing) (the tire)
2. (his fixing) (the tire)

178

Negative Expression:

irritated-
1. (losing sleep) (the past two nights)
2. (two nights) (of lost sleep)
3. (kept him awake) (the past two nights)

worried-
1. (dog having been exposed to the cold) (for two nights in a row)
2. (dog out in the cold) (for two nights)

Incomplete clear causes are given one point in the clear cause column.

Examples of causes given a score of one:

Positive Expression:

relieved-
1. someone stopped (and offered help)
2. someone offered (help)
3. someone offered (to stop)

appreciate-
1. (the tire) being repaired
2. that (he fixed) it

Negative Expression:

irritated-
1. (losing sleep)
2. (for two nights)

worried-
1. (dog out in the cold)

III. Unclear Causes

If the cause is contaminated with distracting information, one or two points are given in the unclear cause column depending on whether one or both elements of the cause are "contaminated."

Examples:

	4	5	6	8
1. She was relieved that he "was nice enough" to stop and help her.	1	2		1
2. She was relieved because he stopped and "was nice enough" to help her.	1	1	1	1

IV. Connections

Clear connections are given one point in the clear connection column. For this inventory there is no unclear connection category.

---

*Written jointly with Dr. Paul Kirwin.

APPENDIX H

FACTOR ANALYTIC DATA REDUCTION

PRE-TESTING FACTOR STRUCTURE

Factor 1 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is   5

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	24	0.90543	Average Quality - Self - Negative	-0.14121	2
2	28	0.82782	Maximum Score - Self - Negative	0.08348	5
3	26	0.81125	Minimum Score - Self - Negative	-0.27143	2
4	20	0.79375	% Non-Distractor - Self - Negative	0.13441	5
5	18	0.48101	Total Score - Other - Negative	0.14879	2

Factor 2 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is   4

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	10	0.77819	Total Word Count - Self - Positive	-0.12227	1
2	11	0.70822	Total Word Count - Self - Negative	-0.09705	3
3	21	0.67196	F of Scorable Responses - Self - Positive	-0.45265	4
4	22	0.60761	F of Scorable Responses - Self - Negative	0.48048	1

PRE-TESTING FACTOR STRUCTURE (continued)

Factor 3 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is   6

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	7	-0.77996	Ambivalent Hostility	0.23067	5
2	4	-0.59943	Hostility Directed Outward - Overt	0.29659	1
3	8	-0.51378	Anxiety - Total	-0.43920	2
4	3	0.51272	Total Human Relatedness	0.18559	4
5	16	0.42031	Minimum Score - Interview	-0.19505	2
6	5	-0.40578	Hostility Directed Outward - Covert	0.15616	1

Factor 4 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is   4

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	23	-1.03325	Average Quality - Self - Positive	0.09230	2
2	27	-0.94102	Maximum Score - Self - Positive	0.31201	2
3	25	-0.82327	Minimum Score - Self - Positive	-0.13657	2
4	19	-0.73671	% Non-Distractor - Self - Positive	0.23403	3

PRE-TESTING FACTOR STRUCTURE (continued)

Factor 5 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is   9

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	15	0.82554	Maximum Score - Interview	-0.12189	1
2	13	0.72417	F of Scorable Responses - Interview	0.39976	2
3	14	0.46637	Average Quality of Response - Interview	0.37171	3
4	12	0.45233	% Non-Distractors - Interview	0.37376	2
5	6	0.40686	Hostility Directed Inward	-0.40566	1
6	17	0.37621	Total Score - Other - Positive	0.34204	1
7	1	0.33335	Zung Depression Scale	-0.27436	1
8	9	0.28442	Feeling Identification Test	0.15145	1
9	2	0.27706	Total Word Count for Interview	-0.15261	1

MID-TESTING FACTOR STRUCTURE

Factor 1 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is   6

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	24	0.96927	Average Quality - Self - Negative	-0.13019	3
2	26	0.96124	Minimum Score - Self - Negative	-0.10078	3
3	28	0.92939	Maximum Score - Self - Negative	-0.13771	3
4	20	0.85023	% Non-Distractor - Self - Negative	0.16715	4
5	22	0.68012	F of Scorable Responses - Self - Negative	0.20951	5
6	8	0.34849	Anxiety - Total	-0.29982	2

Factor 2 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is   7

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	14	0.98783	Average Quality of Response - Interview	0.59386	3
2	3	0.75678	Total Human Relatedness	-0.26671	1
3	7	-0.71097	Ambivalent Hostility	0.12148	1
4	16	0.55360	Minimum Score - Interview	0.39726	4
5	4	-0.48268	Hostility Directed Outward - Overt	0.11085	5
6	9	0.36492	Feeling Identification Test	0.28332	1
7	5	-0.33341	Hostility Directed Outward - Covert	0.23556	1

MID-TESTING FACTOR STRUCTURE (continued)

Factor 3 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is   5

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	15	0.99249	Maximum Score - Interview	0.67165	2
2	12	0.97904	% Non-Distractors - Interview	0.11482	2
3	13	0.79014	F of Scorable Responses - Interview	-0.14421	2
4	18	-0.31902	Total Score - Other - Negative	-0.20467	4
5	1	-0.27307	Zung Depression Scale	0.21944	1

Factor 4 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is   6

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	23	-1.01217	Average Quality - Self - Positive	-0.07655	3
2	27	-0.96517	Maximum Score - Self - Positive	-0.10905	3
3	25	-0.89797	Minimum Score - Self - Positive	-0.10446	2
4	19	-0.67614	% Non-Distractor - Self - Positive	0.27153	2
5	17	-0.25380	Total Score - Other - Positive	-0.15668	3
6	6	0.24569	Hostility Directed Inward	0.20064	2

MID-TESTING FACTOR STRUCTURE (continued)

Factor 5 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is 4

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	10	0.98783	Total Word Count - Self - Positive	-0.37431	3
2	11	0.70416	Total Word Count - Self - Negative	0.13106	3
3	2	0.49602	Total Word Count for Interview	-0.24968	2
4	21	0.46484	F of Scorable Responses - Self - Positive	-0.40996	4

POST-TESTING FACTOR STRUCTURE

Factor 1 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is 9

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	24	1.01130	Average Quality - Self - Negative	0.04438	4
2	28	0.95797	Maximum Score - Self - Negative	0.15655	4
3	20	0.89936	% Non-Distractor - Self - Negative	0.23754	2
4	26	0.89675	Minimum Score - Self - Negative	-0.14357	3
5	14	-0.69988	Average Quality of Response - Interview	0.53350	2
6	22	0.63903	F of Scorable Responses - Self - Negative	0.49666	4
7	16	-0.51496	Minimum Score - Interview	0.43266	2
8	17	0.38576	Total Score - Other - Positive	0.37063	4
9	18	0.37840	Total Score - Other - Negative	0.29808	4

Factor 2 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is 5

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	7	-0.70455	Ambivalent Hostility	-0.59224	1
2	3	0.67224	Total Human Relatedness	0.25997	4
3	4	-0.67086	Hostility Directed Outward - Overt	-0.27194	4
4	2	-0.49550	Total Word Count for Interview	0.22773	4
5	8	-0.47744	Anxiety - Total	0.44891	3

POST-TESTING FACTOR STRUCTURE (continued)

Factor 3 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is   5

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	12	0.97327	% Non-Distractors - Interview	-0.14442	1
2	15	0.74650	Maximum Score - Interview	-0.61936	1
3	6	0.52882	Hostility Directed Inward	-0.24049	5
4	13	0.42964	F of Scorable Responses - Interview	-0.32866	2
5	9	0.21208	Feeling Identification Test	0.17668	5

Factor 4 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is   3

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	10	0.83200	Total Word Count - Self - Positive	0.09279	1
2	11	0.79805	Total Word Count - Self - Negative	-0.41133	2
3	21	0.65646	F of Scorable Responses - Self - Positive	0.40748	5

POST-TESTING FACTOR STRUCTURE (continued)

Factor 5 Items in Descending Order of Factor Loadings
Number of Items in This Factor Is   6

New Number	Old Number	Factor Loading	Text of Item	Next Loading	Factor
1	25	0.88662	Minimum Score - Self - Positive	-0.18359	3
2	23	0.87452	Average Quality - Self - Positive	0.08501	1
3	27	0.73921	Maximum Score - Self - Positive	0.26901	4
4	19	0.70577	% Non-Distractor - Self - Positive	-0.21105	3
5	5	0.34404	Hostility Directed Outward - Covert	-0.34370	2
6	1	-0.30844	Zung Depression Scale	0.25592	3

APPENDIX I

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES

Table 17

Analysis of Variance for U/U versus S/S on Negative
Feeling Expression, Pre-Post

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
A (Group)	929.17	1	929.17	3.57	.10
S (A) Error	1,821.89	7	260.27		

Table 18

Analysis of Variance for U/U versus S/S on Positive
Feeling Expression, Pre-Post

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
A (Group)	1,837.87	1	1,837.87	5.56	.05
S (A) Error	2,313.85	7	330.55		

Table 19

Analysis of Variance for U/S versus S/U on Negative
Feeling Expression, Pre-Mid

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
A (Group)	702.53	1	702.53	3.33	.10
S (A) Error	2,320.56	11	210.96		

Table 20

Analysis of Variance for U/S versus S/U on Negative
Feeling Expression, Pre-Post

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
A (Group)	785.07	1	785.07	3.03	.10
S (A) Error	2,850.10	11	259.10		

Table 21

Analysis of Variance for U/S versus S/U on Positive
Feeling Expression, Pre-Mid

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
A (Group)	686.19	1	686.19	3.77	.08
S (A) Error	2,002.11	11	182.01		

Table 22

Four-Group Analysis of Variance on Negative
Feeling Expression, Pre-Post

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
A (Group)	928.38	3	309.46	2.28	.09
S (A) Error	5,564.93	41	135.73		

REFERENCES

Ackerknecht, L. K. Roleplaying of embarrassing situations. Group Psychotherapy, 1967, 20, 39-42.

Alberti, R. E., & Emmons, M. L. Your perfect right: A guide to assertive behavior. Saint Louis Obispo, Calif.: Impact, 1970.

Alexander, F. Psychosomatic medicine. New York: Norton, 1950.

Bach, G., & Wyden, P. The intimate enemy: How to fight fair in love and marriage. New York: Avon, 1968.

Bales, R. Interaction process analysis, a method for the study of small groups. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1950.

Ballard, H. T. An empirical test of a model of group growth and development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, 1972.

Beck, A. T., Ward, C. H., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. An inventory for measuring depression. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1961, 4, 561-571.

Bentler, P. M. An infant phobia treated with reciprocal inhibition therapy. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 1962, 3, 185-189.

Bergin, A., & Strupp, H. H. Changing frontiers in the science of psychotherapy. New York: Aldine, 1972.

Berkowitz, L. Experimental investigations of hostility catharsis. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 37, 1-7.

Braun, P. R., & Reynolds, D. J. A factor analysis of a 100-item fear survey inventory. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1969, 7, 399-402.

Bumpus, J. F. Toward assertiveness therapy: A discussion of various behavioral techniques. Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Portland, Oregon, 1972.

Buss, A. The psychology of aggression. New York: Wiley, 1961.

Buss, A. H., & Durkee, A. An inventory for assessing different kinds of hostility. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 343-349.

Cattell, R. B., & Eber, H. W. Handbook for the sixteen personality factor questionnaire. Champaigne, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1957.

Cattell, R. B., & Muerle, J. L. The maxplane program for factor rotation to oblique simple structure. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1960, 20, 569-590.

Cattell, R. B., & Scheier, I. H. The meaning and measurement of neuroticism and anxiety. New York: Ronald Press, 1961.

Cautela, J. R., & Kastenbaum, R. A reinforcement survey schedule for use in therapy, training, and research. Psychological Reports, 1967, 20, 1115-1130.

Dahlstrom, W. G., Welsh, G. S., & Dahlstrom, L. E. An MMPI handbook. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1972.

Davitz, J. The language of emotion. New York: Academic Press, 1969.

Dichter, M. Aggression expression as a function of self-esteem level, insult and no insult, and ego-involved and task-oriented directing set. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1965.

Doering, M. F., Hamlin, R. H., Everstine, L., Eigenbrode, C., Chambers, G., Wolpin, M., & Lackner, F. The use of training to increase intensity of angry verbalization. Psychological Monographs, 1962, 76 (Whole No. 556).

Dollard, J., Doob, D. W., Miller, N. E., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R. R. Frustration and aggression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939.

Edwards, A. L. Edwards personal preference schedule manual. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1954.

Fein, L. G. The use of psychodrama to strengthen self concepts of student nurses. Group Psychotherapy, 1963, 16, 161-163.

Ferguson, G. A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Feshbach, S. Dynamics and morality of violence and aggression. American Psychologist, 1971, 26, 281-292.

Freeman, E. M. Effects of aggression expression after frustration on performance: A test of the catharsis hypothesis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1962.

Freud, S. Beyond the pleasure principle (1920). In Complete psychological works, Standard edition, Vol. 21. London: Hogarth Press, 1955.

Friedman, P. H. The effects of modeling, roleplaying, and participation on behavior change. In B. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research. Vol. 6. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Gaines, T. The effects of two types of anger expression on target person's subsequent aggression. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1973.

Geen, R. Effects of frustration, attack, and prior training in aggressiveness upon aggressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 316-321.

Geen, R., & Berkowitz, L. Name-mediated aggressive cue properties. Journal of Personality, 1966, 34, 456-465.

Geen, R., & Berkowitz, L. Some conditions facilitating the occurrence of aggression after the observation of violence. Journal of Personality, 1967, 35, 666-676.

Geisinger, D. L. Controlling sexual and interpersonal anxieties. In J. D. Krumboltz and C. E. Thoresen (Eds.), Behavioral counseling: Cases and techniques. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

Gendlin, E. Experiencing and the creation of meaning. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Goldstein, A. J., Serber, M., & Piaget, G. Induced anger as a reciprocal inhibitor of fear. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1970, 1, 67-70.

Gottschalk, L. A., & Frank, E. C. Estimating the magnitude of anxiety from speech. Behavior Science, 1967, 12, 289-295.

Gottschalk, L., & Gleser, G. The measurement of psychological states through the content analysis of verbal behavior. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Gottschalk, L., Winget, C., & Gleser, G. Manual of instructions for using the Gottschalk-Gleser content analysis scales: Anxiety, hostility, and social alienation-personal disorganization. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Grace, W. J., & Graham, D. T. Relationship of specific attitudes and emotions to certain bodily diseases. Psychosomatic Medicine, 1952, 14, 242-251.

Haer, J. L. Anger in relation to aggression in psychotherapy groups. Journal of Social Psychology, 1968, 76, 123-127.

Harman, H. Modern factor analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Hedquist, F. J., & Weinhold, B. K. Behavioral group counseling with socially anxious and unassertive college students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 237-242.

Hokanson, J. Psychophysiological evaluation of the catharsis hypothesis. In E. A. Megargee and J. E. Hokanson (Eds.), Dynamics of aggression. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Hokanson, J., & Burgess, M. The effects of status, type of frustration and aggression on vascular processes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 232-237. (a)

Hokanson, J., & Burgess, M. The effects of three types of aggression on vascular processes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 446-449. (b)

Hokanson, J., Burgess, M., & Cohen, M. Effects of displaced aggression on systolic blood pressure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 214-218.

Hokanson, J. E., Willers, K. R., & Koropsak, E. The modification of autonomic responses during aggressive interchange. Journal of Personality, 1968, 36, 386-404.

Holmes, D. A. An experimental study of catharsis and guilt in aggressive behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1963.

Holt, R. On the interpersonal and intrapersonal consequences of expressing or not expressing anger. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 35, 8-12.

Honhart, B. An investigation of catharsis: Overt aggression and heart-rate as functions of retaliation and arousal and opportunity for aggression. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1970.

Horowitz, M. Hostility and its management in classroom groups. In W. W. Charters and N. L. Gage (Eds.), Readings in the social psychology of education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1963.

Janov, A. The primal scream--primal therapy: The cure for neurosis. New York: Dell, 1970.

Kaufmann, H., & Feshbach, S. Displaced aggression and its modification through exposure to anti-aggressive communications. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 79-83.

Kiesler, D. Some myths of psychotherapy research and the search for a paradigm. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 65, 110-136.

Kimble, G. A. Hilgard and Marquis' conditioning and learning. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

Kirwin, P. Affect expression training in psychiatric patients: The verbalization of feeling-cause relationships. Unpublished manuscript, Durham, N. C. V.A. Hospital, 1970.

Kirwin, P. Expressive training manual. Unpublished manuscript, Durham, N. C. V.A. Hospital, 1971.

Kirwin, P., Damgaard, J., & Gentry, W. D. Affect expression training in psychiatric patients: Verbalization of feeling-cause relationships. Unpublished study, Durham, N. C. V.A. Hospital, 1973.

Krumboltz, J., & Thoresen, C. Behavioral counseling: Cases and techniques. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

Lazarus, A. A. Behavior rehearsal vs. nondirective therapy vs. advice in effecting behavior change. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1966, 4, 209-212.

Lazarus, A. Behavior therapy and beyond. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Lazarus, A. A. On assertive behavior: A brief note. Behavior Therapy, 1973, 4, 697-699.

Lazarus, A., & Abramovitz, A. The use of 'emotive imagery' in the treatment of children's phobias. Journal of Mental Science, 1962, 108, 109-195.

Leary, T. The interpersonal diagnosis of personality. New York: Ronald Press, 1957.

Liberman, R. Reinforcement of cohesiveness in group therapy. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1971, 25, 168-177.

Liberman, R. A guide to behavioral analysis and therapy. New York: Pergamon Press, 1972.

Lomont, J. F., Gilner, F. H., Spector, N. J., & Skinner, K. K. Group assertion training and group insight therapies. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 463.

Lorenz, K. On aggression. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1966.

Lowen, A. The language of the body. New York: Collier Books, 1958.

Luborsky, L., Auerbach, A. H., Chandler, M., Cohen, J., & Bachrach, H. M. Factors influencing the outcome of psychotherapy: A review of quantitative research. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 75, 145-185.

Martinson, W. D., & Zerface, J. P. Comparison of individual counseling and a social program with nondaters. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 36-40.

Matarazzo, J. D. An experimental study of aggression in the hypertensive patient. Journal of Personality, 1954, 22, 423-435.

McFall, R. M., & Lillesand, D. B. Behavior rehearsal with modeling and coaching in assertion training. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1971, 77, 313-323.

McFall, R. M., & Marston, A. R. An experimental investigation of behavior rehearsal in assertive training. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1970, 76, 295-303.

Neuman, D. Using assertive training. In J. D. Krumboltz and C. E. Thoresen (Eds.), Behavioral counseling: Cases and techniques. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

Overall, J. E., & Gorham, D. P. The brief psychiatric rating scale. Psychological Reports, 1962, 10, 799-912.

Patterson, W. E., Taulbee, E. S., Folsom, J. C., Horner, R. F., & Wright, H. W. Comparison of two forms of milieu therapy. Paper presented at the Veterans Administration Cooperative Studies in Psychiatry, Denver, Colorado, April, 1968.

Paul, G. Strategy of outcome research in psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 109-118.

Perls, F. The Gestalt approach and eye witness to therapy. Ben Lomond, Calif.: Science and Behavior Books, 1973.

Pfeiffer, J., & Jones, J. A handbook of structured experiences for human relations training. Iowa City, Iowa: University Associates Press, 1969-70-71.

Rathus, S. A. An experimental investigation of assertive training in a group setting. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1972, 3, 1-6.

Rathus, S. A. Instigation of assertive behavior through videotape-mediated assertive models and directed practice. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1973, 11, 57-65.

Rathus, S. A. A 30-item schedule for assessing assertive behavior. Behavior Therapy, 1973, in press.

Rogers, C. Client-centered therapy: Its current practice, implications, and theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

Rogers, C. Carl Rogers on encounter groups. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Rogers, C., & Dymond, R. F. (Eds.) Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Rothenburg, A. On anger. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1971, 128, 454-460.

Rubin, T. The angry book. New York: Macmillan, 1969.

Salter, A. Conditioned reflex therapy. New York: Capricorn Books, 1961.

Saul, L. J. The hostile mind. New York: Random House, 1956.

Schachter, J. Pain, fear, and anger in hypertensives and normotensives: A psycho-physiological study. Psychosomatic Medicine, 1957, 19, 17-29.

Schutz, W. C. Joy. New York: Grove Press, 1967.

Schutz, W. C. Here comes every body. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Scott, J. P. Aggression. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Seitz, P. F. D. Dynamically oriented brief psychotherapy: Psychocutaneous excoriation syndrome. Psychosomatic Medicine, 1953, 15, 200.

Stone, L., & Hokanson, J. Arousal reduction via self-punitive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 12, 72-79.

Taylor, J. A. A personality scale of manifest anxiety. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 285-290.

Wagner, M. K. Comparative effectiveness of behavioral rehearsal and verbal reinforcement for effecting anger expressiveness. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22, 1079-1080. (a)

Wagner, M. K. Reinforcement of the expression of anger through role-playing. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1968, 6, 91-95. (b)

Wittenborn, J. R. Wittenborn psychiatric rating scales. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1955.

Wolpe, J. Psychotherapy by reciprocal inhibition. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1958.

Wolpe, J. The practice of behavior therapy. Elmsford, N. Y.: Pergamon Press, 1969.

Wolpe, J. The instigation of assertive behavior: Transcripts from two cases. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1970, 1, 145-151.

Wolpe, J., & Lang, P. A fear survey schedule for use in behavior therapy. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1964, 2, 27.

Wolpe, J., & Lazarus, A. A. Behavior therapy techniques. New York: Pergamon Press, 1966.

Zung, W. W. A self-rating depression scale. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1965, 12, 63.

Zung, W. W., Richards, C. B., & Short, M. J. Self-rating depression scale in an outpatient clinic. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1965, 13, 508.

BIOGRAPHY

Jacqueline Ann Damgaard

Born: Council Bluffs, Iowa; June 18, 1944

Education: University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.   1962-1967
      B.S. with honors
      (Major: Psychology; Minor: Philosophy)

      Duke University, Durham, N. C.   1967-1973
      Ph.D. Program in Clinical Psychology

Awards:

    National Merit Scholarship (1962)
    American Association of University Women (1962)
    Bausch & Lomb Honorary Science Award (1962)
    University of Wisconsin Honor Scholarship (1962)
    Elwin Willet Scholarship (1962)
    Kemper K. Knapp Scholarship (1962-1966)
    Sloan Foundation Award (1963)
    Madison Professional Women's Association Award (1963)
    Sigma Epsilon Sigma (1967)
    University of Wisconsin Honors' Degree (1967)

Memberships:

    Psi Chi
    American Academy of Science
    American Psychological Association
    Southeastern Psychological Association

Research Appointments since B.S.:

U.N.C. Institute for Research in the Social Sciences	1967-1968
Duke University Psychology Department	1967-1969
Psychical Research Foundation	1970-1972
Duke Engineering Controlled Personal Environment Laboratory	1970-1971

Academic Appointments since B.S.:

Teaching Assistant in Abnormal Psychology	Fall, 1969
Teaching Assistant in Theories of Personality	Fall, 1970
Roanoke Rapids, N. C. School System	1968-1970
Roanoke Rapids, N. C. Mental Health Center	1970-1971
Durham, N. C. V.A. Hospital Internship in Clinical Psychology	Jan.-Dec., 1973
Instructor in Psychology, Duke University	Jan.-June, 1973
Assistant Professor in Psychology, Georgia State University	Sept., 1973-

Publications:

Damgaard, J. A. Content analysis of free verbal response material. Proceedings of the Parapsychological Association, 1970, 7, 18-19.

Roll, W. G., Morris, R. L., Damgaard, J. A., & Klein, J. K. Free verbal response tests with Lalsingh Harribance. Proceedings of the Parapsychological Association, 1970, 7, 21-23.

Damgaard, J. A. A summary of additional research with Lalsingh Harribance. Proceedings of the Parapsychological Association, 1971, 8, 74-76.

Roll, W. G., Morris, R. L., Damgaard, J. A., Klein, J., & Roll, M. Free verbal response experiments with Lalsingh Harribance. Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research, 1973, 67, 197-207.

Damgaard, J. A., Klein, J., Morris, R. L., Roll, M., & Roll, W. G. Psychological studies of Lalsingh Harribance in relation to the results of two free verbal response experiments. In W. G. Roll, R. L. Morris, & J. D. Morris (Eds.), Research in parapsychology: 1972. Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1973.

Kirwin, P. K., Damgaard, J. A., & Gentry, W. D. Affect expression training in psychiatric patients: Verbalization of feeling-cause relationships, in press.

40